[This Document is the Property of His Britannic Majesty's Government.]

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. October 1911.

CONFIDENTIAL.

(9907.)

F.O. 424/225

F.O. 93

424

CLOSED UNTIL

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS

OF

ASIATIC TURKEY AND ARABIA.

[In continuation of Confidential Paper No. 9746.]

225

October to December 1910.

[This Document is the Property of His Britannic Majesty's Government.]

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. *October* 1911.

CONFIDENTIAL.

(9907.)

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS

OF

ASIATIC TURKEY AND ARABIA.

[In continuation of Confidential Paper No. 9746.]

October to December 1910.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
1	India Office ..	..	Sept. 30, 1910	El Odeid. Transmits telegram to Viceroy, enquiring whether Turkish mudir has actually arrived at El Odeid	1
2	To Sir G. Lowther ..	295 Tel.	Oct. 1,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Action reported in No. 152, Confidential Paper No. 9746, approved	1
3	Sir G. Lowther ..	213 Tel.	2,	El Odeid. Acting vali says he is ignorant of the whole question	1
4	„ „ ..	681 Confidential	Sept. 23,	Druses. Transmits despatch from consul at Damascus, reporting that Druses will probably submit to Turkish authorities if latter will protect them against Bedouin ..	2
5	„ „ ..	682	22,	Samsoun-Sivas Railway. Turkish Government have decided to build line "en régie." Attitude of Russian Ambassador ..	3
6	„ „ ..	687	27,	Capitulations at Damascus. Refers to No. 132, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Transmits report from His Majesty's consul at Damascus, reporting joint action of consular body in view of irregularities in local police action complained of. Comments on general question	3
7	„ „ ..	688	27,	Lands of Sheikh of Mohammerah. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, reporting on decision of Council of State that sheikh shall be allowed to register no more land on Turkish territory	7
8	„ „ ..	689	27,	Situation in Hauran. Refers to No. 4. Transmits further despatch from His Majesty's consul at Damascus concerning (see No. 44)	8
9	India Office ..	..	Oct. 3,	El Odeid. Transmits telegram from Viceroy to effect that resident at Bushire does not think mudir has yet arrived	8
10	Sir G. Lowther ..	215 Tel.	3,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 152, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Porte suggests plaintiff should bring action against vali in local courts. Mr. Lorimer reports they could not expect a fair hearing, and urges strong measures ..	9
11	„ „ ..	217 Tel.	4,	Druses. Refers to No. 4. Fighting in consequence of arrest of Yahia Atrash. His Majesty's consul at Damascus does not think Druses will hold out long	9
12	„ „ ..	694	Sept. 30,	El Odeid. Appointment of mudir at. Refers to No. 139, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Transmits copy of written protest handed to Minister for Foreign Affairs. Bussorah authorities instructed not to make appointment, and to cancel it if already made ..	9
13	To India Office ..	..	Oct. 5,	Bagdad and Persian Gulf. Transmits draft despatch, and comments on details of with reference to No. 110, Confidential Paper No. 9746 (see Nos. 15 and 120) ..	10
13*	India Office ..	..	6,	Abu Musa. Transmits telegram from Viceroy relative to relations of sheikhs in Abu Musa district	11*

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
14	To Sir G. Lowther ..	304 Tel.	Oct. 6, 1910	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. His Majesty's Government cannot regard Rifaat Pasha's statements as satisfactory. His Majesty's Government will hold Porte liable for acts of minor officials ..	11
15	India Office ..	..	7,	Bagdad and Persian Gulf. Acknowledges No. 13. Comments on draft despatch concerning Turkish action in	11
16	Sir G. Lowther ..	702	5,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 144, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad concerning attempt to cut through residency grounds	12
17	„ „ ..	703	5,	Grand Shereef of Mecca. Refers to No. 108, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's acting consul at Jeddah concerning movements of	13
18	„ „ ..	704	5,	Vali of Bagdad. Refers to No. 145, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad concerning. Quite likely that vali's attitude dictated from Constantinople	13
19	Note communicated by Colonel Picot	..	12,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Note respecting consulate premises (see No. 48)	15
20	India Office ..	..	15,	El Odeid and sheikh's Fedaghia property. Transmits telegram from Bushire respecting	16
21	Sir G. Lowther ..	706	6,	American Trans-Anatolian Railway scheme. Transmits two despatches from His Majesty's consular officers at Kharput and Erzeroum concerning	16
22	„ „ ..	712	7,	German colony at Haifa. Transmits two despatches from acting consul-general at Beirout concerning attacks on two Germans	18
23	„ „ ..	715	9,	Pan-Islamism. Transmits pamphlet concerning and comments	20
24	„ „ ..	718	10,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Transmits note communicated to Rifaat Pasha respecting demolitions	28
25	„ „ ..	720	10,	Sheikh of Koweit's Fedaghia property. Turkish Government would never acknowledge Koweit as a separate nationality ..	28
26	„ „ ..	725	12,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, reporting encroachments of municipal authorities on property of British subjects (see Nos. 46 and 61) ..	29
27	„ „ ..	727	12,	Bagdad and Persian Gulf. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, reporting false allegations made by Hekmet Pasha regarding British action in Persian Gulf	53
28	„ „ ..	729	12,	Turkish army. Transmits despatch from military attaché, giving observations on interest taken by Germany in efficiency of IVth Ordu	54

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
29	India Office ..	..	Oct. 17, 1910	Sheikh of Koweit's Fedaghia property. Transmits telegram from Government of India. Agrees in draft despatch to Constantinople	55
30	„ „ ..	..	17,	Sheikh of Koweit's Fedaghia property; El Odeid. Transmits telegram from Consul-General Cox regarding	56
31	„ „ ..	..	17,	El Odeid. Transmits telegram from Viceroy relative to Turkish repudiation in 1872 of any designs on independence of tribes along Persian Gulf littoral	57
32	To Sir G. Lowther ..	312	17,	Local authorities in Asiatic Turkey. Acknowledges No. 110, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Should make representations to Turkish Government regarding, especially concerning Sheikh of Mohammerah (see Nos. 37 and 105)	57
33	Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company	..	13,	Lynch fusion scheme. Discusses question since July (see Nos. 65 and 81).. ..	61
34	India Office ..	..	17,	Suggested treaty with Katr Sheikh. Transmits telegram to Viceroy, asking for opinion of Government of India concerning	62
35	„ „ ..	..	18,	Mudirate of Zubara. Transmits telegram from Colonel Cox respecting revival of Mudirate of Zubara	62
36	Sir G. Lowther ..	225 Tel.	17,	Zakhnuniyeh. Refers to No. 151, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Vali of Bussorah has been instructed not to allow gendarmes, unless authorised by Government, to return to Zakhnuniyeh (see No. 93) ..	63
37	To Sir G. Lowther ..	314	18,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 32. Should draw up valuation of damage and present it to Minister for Foreign Affairs (see No. 63)	63
38	India Office ..	..	19,	Muscat. Transmits enclosures in letter to Government of India relative to American missionary dispensary at Mutra . ..	63
39	To Sir G. Lowther ..	317 Tel.	21,	Murdirate at Zubara. Informs Sir G. Lowther of revival of (see No. 94) ..	64
40	Sir G. Lowther ..	732	14,	Vali of Bussorah. Transmits consular report describing arrangements made by vali in concert with Sheikh of Mohammerah to prevent river piracy (see Nos. 41 and 62)	64
41	„ „ ..	733	14,	Vali of Bussorah. Refers to No. 40. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah concerning administration and recall of (see No. 43)	65
42	„ „ ..	735	16,	Van and district. Refers to No. 5, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Transmits despatch from vice-consul at Van, reporting on failure of expeditions against the Goyan and other Kurds	66
43	„ „ ..	739	16,	Vali of Bussorah. Refers to No. 41. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah concerning resignation of ..	67
44	„ „ ..	745	18,	Hauran; Druses. Refers to No. 8. Transmits despatches from His Majesty's consul at Damascus concerning, General Sami Pasha's measures for pacification of Druse country (see No. 60)	68

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
45	Sir G. Lowther ..	747	Oct. 18, 1910	Hedjaz Railway. Hedjaz Railway administration have been insisting in contracts that foreign subjects should submit to Ottoman law. Transmits note to Porte and circular note from Porte	70
46	„ „ ..	751	18,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 26. Transmits detailed report regarding attempt to close Abdul Ali's ice factory (see No. 57)	72
47	„ „ ..	232 Tel.	24,	Turkish aggression in Persian Gulf. Owing to temporarily strained relations with Porte, it would be advisable to postpone presenting of communication relative to local authorities at Bagdad, Zakhnuniyeh, El Odeid, Sheikh of Mohammerah, &c. (see Nos. 51 and 53)	74
48	To Messrs. Lynch Brothers	..	21,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 19. His Majesty's Ambassador has asked Turkish Government to instruct local authorities to indemnify British subjects. Enquires whether Messrs. Lynch contemplate bringing an action (see Nos. 54 and 75)	74
49	India Office ..	..	24,	Sheikh of Koweit's properties on the Shatt-el-Arab. Transmits enclosures in letter to Government of India relative to registration (see No. 107)	75
50	Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company	..	24,	Lynch Company and Vali of Bussorah. Refers to No. 30, Confidential Paper No. 9746. "Blosse Lynch" substituted for steamer temporarily under repairs in spite of vali's prohibition	77
51	To Sir G. Lowther ..	323 Tel.	26,	Turkish aggression in Persian Gulf. Refers to No. 47. Agrees to not communicating despatch in writing. To make strong representations in writing with regard to Smyrna-Aidin Railway and registrations of lands of Sheikhs of Koweit and Mohammerah	77
52	„ „ ..	326	28,	Lynch Company. Refers to No. 34, Confidential Paper No. 9745. Transmits No. 33, referring to recent permits from authorities to natives for navigating rivers of Mesopotamia (see No. 92) ..	77
53	India Office ..	..	28,	Great Britain and Turkey. Deplores fact that note protesting against Turkish treatment of British subjects in Asia Minor and Turkish territorial encroachments (see No. 47) has been delayed in presentation..	78
54	Messrs. Lynch Brothers	..	28,	Lynch's premises at Bagdad. Refers to No. 48. Central Government to be held responsible for losses incurred by action of vali. Hopes His Majesty's Government will adhere to this point of view ..	78
55	Sir G. Lowther ..	237 Tel.	29,	Druses. Revolt has come to an end ..	79
56	„ „ ..	238 Tel.	29,	Vilayet of Bussorah. His Majesty's consul reports raid on date plantation at Fedaghia. Attitude of vali (see No. 108)	79
57	„ „ ..	756	21,	Ice factories at Bagdad. Refers to No. 46. Transmits *note verbale* to Turkish Government on subject of closing of ice factories owned by British Indian subjects ..	79
58	„ „ ..	764	25,	Beirout district. Transmits consular report on local affairs in Beirout district for quarter ended 30th December	80

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
59	Sir G. Lowther ..	765	Oct. 25, 1910	Damascus and district and situation in Hauran. Refers to No. 67, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Transmits despatch from Mr. Devey concerning	81
60	„ „ ..	766	25,	Druses. Refers to No. 44. Transmits despatch from Mr. Devey concerning (see No. 84)	82
61	„ „ ..	768	25,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 26. Transmits correspondence with vali on subject of demolition of house belonging to Seyyid Ali Khan (see No. 68)	83
62	„ „ ..	769	25,	Vilayet of Bussorah. Refers to No. 40. Transmits report of His Majesty's acting consul at Mohammerah as to case of piracy already reported	87
63	„ „ ..	770	23,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. His Majesty's consul has been requested (as desired in No. 37) to furnish valuation of damage to property of British subjects at Bagdad, Kerbela, Kazimia, &c... ..	88
64	„ „ ..	777	26,	Great Britain and Turkey. Transmits detailed account of anti-British meeting held in Constantinople to protest against British action in Southern Persia (see No. 73) ..	89
65	Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company	..	31,	Lynch Company and congestion of traffic. Refers to No. 33. Grievance that company can only put a certain number of steamers on river, and is therefore unable to expand or contract its fleet as trade may demand (see No. 113)	90
66	India Office ..	..	Nov. 1,	Vali of Bussorah. Transmits telegram from Viceroy relative to Vali of Bussorah and proposed kaimakam prescribed by Turkish Government for Sheikh of Koweit ..	90
67	Sir G. Lowther ..	781	Oct. 30,	Erzeroum and district. Transmits consular despatch reporting speech by Vartkess Effendi, deputy for Erzeroum, in which he advocated the maintenance of good relations with England and France	91
68	„ „ ..	788	31,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 61. Transmits consular report on further demolitions (see No. 86) ..	92
69	„ „ ..	790	30,	Anatolian provinces. Transmits consular report with reference to	93
70	„ „ ..	793	Nov. 2,	Diarbekir and district. Transmits consular despatch relative to land question in Diarbekir vilayet	96
71	„ „ ..	795	Oct. 31,	Great Britain and Turkey. Interview with Minister for Foreign Affairs. His regret at unsympathetic attitude of Triple *Entente* Powers. His assurances as to wronged British subjects	97
72	„ „ ..	797	31,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Sheikh of Koweit's Fedaghia property. Appointment of mudirs to Wakra and Zobara. Zakhmuniyeh. Smyrna-Aidin Railway. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs (see Nos. 83 and 105)	98
73	„ „ ..	801	Nov. 2,	Great Britain and Turkey. Refers to No. 64. Results of meeting in Constantinople to protest against British action in Southern Persia. Excitement calming down. German attitude	99

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
74	Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company	..	Nov. 7, 1910	Lynch Company and Vali of Bussorah. Transmits telegram to effect that vali will not permit substitution of "Blosse Lynch" for "Julnar," now under repairs (see Nos. 79 and 80)	99
75	To Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company	..	7,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 48. Compensation has been demanded from Central Government for demolition of Lynch premises	100
76	To Sir G. Lowther ..	329 Tel.	8,	Lynch Company and Vali of Bussorah. Vali refuses to allow company to run steamer in place of "Julnar" (see No. 78) ..	100
77	To India Office ..	..	8,	Abu Musa oxide. Position arising out of cancellation of contract. Validity of Messrs. Wönckhaus' claim	101
78	Mr. Marling ..	245 Tel.	9,	Lynch Company and Vali of Bussorah. Refers to No. 76. Hears from Minister of Interior that vali has been instructed to allow Lynch to replace the "Julnar" by "Blosse Lynch"	102
79	Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company	..	9,	Lynch Company and Vali of Bussorah. Refers to No. 74. "Julnar" must be repaired. His Majesty's Government must assist company to obtain leave to substitute "Blosse Lynch"	102
80	To Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company	..	10,	Lynch Company and Vali of Bussorah. Refers to No. 74. Vali has been instructed by Minister of Interior to allow "Blosse Lynch" to be substituted for "Julnar" (see No. 95)	102
81	Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company	..	10,	Lynch fusion scheme. Refers to No. 33. Company desires to run greater number of steamers and to put steamers on Tigris. Prepared to run steamers under Ottoman flag, but this would be a second best course of action	103
82	Mr. D'Arcy ..	..	11,	Anatolian Railway project. Negotiations between Chester group and Turkish Government. Possible effect on oil concession	103
83	Mr. Marling ..	246 Tel.	12,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Sheikh of Mohammerah and Turkish authorities. Refers to No. 72. Has heard that Minister of Interior will arrange that compensation is given for demolition of Lynch's premises, and that sheikh will be allowed to register his property	104
84	Sir G. Lowther ..	808	4,	Druses. Refers to No. 60. Transmits consular despatch reporting further concerning	104
85	„ „ ..	814	8,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Transmits consular despatch reporting on municipal demolitions at Karbala ..	105
86	„ „ ..	815	8,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 68. Transmits consular despatch submitting copy of a report by Mr. Parry in connection with the demolition of certain buildings at Bagdad (see No. 147)	109
87	„ „ ..	816	8,	Lynch Company. Transmits consular despatch relating to an attempt to divert trade from company, and papers by company's agent	110

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
88	Sir G. Lowther ..	817	Nov. 8, 1910	Lynch Company. Refers to No 55, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Transmits consular despatch forwarding observations from Lynch's agent on scheme of starting a steamer service between Bagdad and Mosul	112
89	„ „ ..	819	8,	Lynch Company and Turkish Government. Question of duty to be paid on "Julnar" .	113
90	„ „ ..	820	8,	Lynch Company and Vali of Bussorah. Vali has referred matter of substitution of "Blosse Lynch" for "Julnar" to Minister of Interior. Minister of Interior has come to favourable decision ..	114
91	„ „ ..	822	8,	Bagdad Railway. Transmits letter from Sir W. Willcocks, explaining possible railways from Bagdad to Bussorah	114
92	„ „ ..	824	8,	Lynch fusion scheme. Acknowledges receipt of No. 52. Courses open to His Majesty's Government in order to protect Lynch's from increased competition likely to ensue from breakdown of Government monopoly existing prior to deposition of ex-Sultan ..	115
93	Mr. Marling ..	248 Tel.	14,	Zakhnuniyeh. Refers to No. 36. The gendarmes have fled from the island. Perhaps an expedient on part of Turks to avoid formally recalling their forces	116
94	„ „ ..	249 Tel.	15,	Wakra and El Odeid. Refers to No. 39. "Redbreast" heard nothing of Turkish mudirs at	117
95	To Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company ..		16,	Lynch steamers. Acknowledges No. 80. No opinion can be given until observations of Sir G. Lowther and Mr. Marling have been received	117
96	Mr. Marling ..	828	12,	Erzeroum and district. Refers to No. 70, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Transmits consular despatch, transmitting despatch from Bitlis reporting on Kurdish lawlessness in Khnyt district	117
97	Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company ..		21,	Lynch premises. The company's machinery and repair shops are involved in proposed demolition (see No. 101)	118
98	Messrs. Lynch Brothers ..		21,	Lynch premises. Asks if instructions have been sent by His Majesty's chargé d'affaires in Constantinople to prevent premises being pulled down (see Nos. 100 and 102)	118
99	To Mr. Marling ..	333 Tel.	22,	Lynch premises. Asks for information as to report of proposal to demolish premises on 29th instant	119
100	Messrs. Lynch Brothers ..		23,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Lynch premises. Refers to No. 98. Transmits telegram from agents in Bagdad, reporting assessment agreed to by political agent in Turkish Arabia	119
101	To Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company ..		24,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Lynch premises. Replies to No. 97. Instructions have been sent to His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople to urge Turkish Government postponement of demolition until compensation has been arranged ..	120

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
102	To Messrs. Lynch and Co. ..		Nov. 24, 1910	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Lynch premises. Replies to No. 98. Instructions have been sent	120
103	To Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company ..		25,	Bussorah customs. Grand Vizierate hold that precedent of 1877, by which when "Blosse Lynch" was admitted duty free, cannot apply to present case (see No. 122)	120
104	Mr. Marling ..	840	10,	Druses. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Damascus, reporting gradual subsiding of	121
105	„ „ ..	843	23,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Lynch premises. Refers to Nos. 32 and 72. Minister of Interior has practically decided to give compensation for demolition. Vali of Bagdad. Committee perhaps anxious he should do badly. Lynch Company's steamers. Registration of Sheikh of Mohammerah's lands. Transmits two telegrams from Consul-General Lorimer (see Nos. 106, 112, and 116)	122
106	„ „ ..	851	23,	Zakhnuniyeh. Refers to No. 105. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah concerning	124
107	India Office		23,	Shatt-el-Arab piracy. Refers to No. 49. Transmits telegram from Indian Government. Perhaps appointment of new vali will make it possible to obtain co-operation of Turkish local authorities (see No. 114)	125
108	Mr. Marling ..	859	24,	Mishri incident. Refers to No. 56. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah concerning (see No. 124) ..	126
109	„ „ ..	861	26,	Bussorah. Insecurity at. His Majesty's consul fears disaster similar to that at Maghil in 1906	128
110	„ „ ..	864	30,	Beirout and district. Transmits despatch from acting consul-general at Beirout, reporting on local events in	128
111	„ „ ..	865	29,	Vali of Bagdad. Refers to No. 105. Probable intention of committee to recall and disgrace Nazim. Mission of Ismail Hakki Bey Babanzadeh. Rifaat Pasha promises compensation for demolitions	130
112	„ „ ..	868	30,	Euphrates and Tigris Navigation Company. Refers to No. 105. Transmits article in "Tanin," stating that part of Bagdad municipal loan is to be devoted to purchase of two steamers for the municipality ..	131
113	To Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company ..		Dec. 5,	Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company. Refers to No. 65. Sir G. Lowther thinks fusion negotiations have little hope of success	132
114	To India Office ..	..	6,	Shatt-el-Arab piracy. Acknowledges No. 107. Concurs in proposed telegram to Viceroy	132
115	„ „ ..	..	6,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Transmits No. 105. Suggests that "Redbreast" should visit Zakhnuniyeh to restore British prestige	133

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
116	To Mr. Marling ..	337 Tel.	Dec. 8, 1910	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Lynch premises. Refers to No. 105. Report that demolition commenced 1st December. Authorities have only deposited £T. 508 plus 20 per cent.	133
117	Mr. Marling ..	255 Tel.	9,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Lynch premises. Impossible to take any legal action pending result of protest filed by Lynch	133
118	„ „ ..	256 Tel.	9,	Damascus and district. His Majesty's consul at Damascus reports that Kerak is menaced by 1,500 Arabs and Druses, and that Arabs have attacked Hedjaz Railway at Catraneh	133
119	India Office ..	..	8,	Sheikh of Koweit and Turkish authorities. Transmits copy of enclosures in letter to Government of India relative to ..	134
120	„ „ ..	..	9,	El Katr. British interests in Mesopotamia. Zakhnuniyeh. Refers to No. 13. Does not think treaties with Katr tribes necessary. Agrees that "Redbreast" should visit Zakhnuniyeh	136
121	Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company	..	9,	Lynch fusion scheme. Acknowledges No. 113. Regret at inability of Sir G. Lowther to take adequate measures to safeguard British interests in Mesopotamia (see No. 150)	138
122	„ „	..	9,	Lynch steamers. Acknowledges No. 103. Has never paid duty on any steamers ..	138
122*	Sir G. Lowther ..	258 Tel.	11,	Hedjaz. Murders on line. Reports ..	138*
123	Mr. Marling ..	259 Tel.	11,	Bagdad and district. Concurs in Mr. Lorimer's opinion that visit to Bagdad of Admiral Commanding Indian Station would be inexpedient (see Nos. 127 and 131)	138
124	„ „ ..	879	7,	Mishri incident. Refers to No. 108. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah concerning	139
125	„ „ ..	883	7,	Samos. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at, reporting on condition of affairs at	141
126	To Messrs. Lynch Brothers	..	12,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Lynch premises. Mr. Marling sees no possibility of taking action at Constantinople with regard to proposed demolition (see No. 140)	144
127	To Admiralty ..	Confidential	13,	Bagdad and district. Transmits No. 123. Concurs in view expressed by Mr. Marling and His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, that visit of commander-in-chief is to be deprecated (see No. 128) ..	144
128	To India Office ..	..	14,	Persian Gulf. Agrees that it would be useless to conclude treaties with Katr sheikhs. Transmits No. 127	144
129	To Admiralty ..	..	14,	Bagdad and Persian Gulf. Transmits No. 105. India Office suggests Turkish soldiers or flags should be removed from Zakhnuniyeh, and that "Redbreast" should be accompanied by other ships from blockading squadron on Persian coast (see No. 138)	144

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
130	India Office ..	..	Dec. 14, 1910	Piracies in Persian Gulf. Transmits telegram to Viceroy concerning (see No. 137)	145
131	Mr. Marling ..	260 Tel.	15,	Bagdad and district. Refers to No. 123. Has received telegram from Admiral Slade, saying he is ready to put off his projected visit to Bagdad	145
132	„ „ ..	261 Tel.	16,	Yemen. His Majesty's vice-consul at Hodeidah confirms rumours of renewed troubles in Yemen	146
133	„ „ ..	888	11,	Erzeroum and district. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Erzeroum, reporting on attitude of Acting Vali of Bitlis, and giving instances of Kurdish lawlessness	146
134	„ „ ..	898	14,	Erzeroum and district. Refers to No. 56, Confidential Paper No. 9746. Reports fighting between Turks and Kurds ..	147
135	„ „ ..	901	14,	Yemen. Reports seizure of Italian dhow at Hodeidah. Complaints by Italian Ambassador. Probably dhow was engaged in smuggling	147
136	„ „ ..	262 Tel.	19,	Piracies in Persian Gulf. Reports respecting question of surrender to His Majesty's Government or to Sheikh of Mohammerah of men concerned. Rebuff likely ..	149
137	To India Office ..	..	21,	Shatt-el-Arab piracy. Refers to No. 130. Transmits No. 136. Asks for views, and whether arrangements have been made for patrolling Shatt-el-Arab by His Majesty's ships	149
138	Admiralty	Confidential	21,	Bagdad and Persian Gulf. Replies to points raised in No. 129 relative to occupation of Zakhnuniyeh and visit of Admiral Slade to Bagdad	149
139	Messrs. Lynch Brothers	..	21,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Transmits note concerning Nazim Pasha for transmission to His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople	150
140	„ „	..	21,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Lynch premises. Acknowledges No. 126. Will not take legal steps until advised to ..	151
141	To Mr. Marling ..	368	24,	Lynch fusion scheme. Transmits No. 122. Proposed reply to enquiries as to how far foreign capital admissible in Turkish enterprise for navigating Tigris and Euphrates	151
142	Mr. Marling ..	264 Tel.	27,	Druses. Line between Maan and Tabuk damaged	151
143	„ „ ..	904	15,	Aleppo and district. Transmits two despatches from His Majesty's consul at Aleppo, reporting on removal of public prosecutor from Aleppo to Adana	152
144	Mr. Marling ..	905	15,	Adana. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's vice-consul, reporting posting up of reactionary placards denouncing Government and Christians	155
145	„ „ ..	906	15,	Mosul and district. Transmits consular despatch relative to military situation ..	156

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
146	Mr. Marling ..	908	Dec. 18, 1910	Erzeroum. Education question. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul at Erzeroum, reporting on refusal of Armenian bishop to comply with new regulation requiring Armenian schools to submit to inspection	156
147	„ „ ..	916	21,	Vali of Bagdad and British subjects. Refers to No. 86. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul-general on subject of demolitions	157
148	„ „ ..	918 Confidential	20,	Anglo-Turkish relations. Conversation with Rifaat concerning Albania, Bagdad demolitions, and Committee of Union and Progress	162
149	„ „ ..	66 Consular	21.	Bagdad and district. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, giving further reasons against transfer of Bagdad post to Levant consular service	163
150	To Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company ..		28,	Lynch steamers. Answers No. 121. Considers it useless to press Turkish Government further	165
151	India Office		30.	Bagdad and Persian Gulf. Zakhnuniyeh. Piracies in neighbourhood of and advisability of sending a ship. Transmits correspondence concerning. Necessity of defining our position in Persian Gulf ..	166

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. February 1911.

CONFIDENTIAL.

Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Asiatic Turkey and Arabia.

[In continuation of Confidential Paper No. 9746.]

[35515] No. 1.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 1.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 28th September, relative to the appointment of a Turkish mudir at El Odeid.

India Office, September 30, 1910.

Enclosure in No. 1.

Viscount Morley to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P. *India Office, September* 28, 1910.

PLEASE telegraph whether Turkish mudir has actually arrived at El Odeid. The Porte's reply to the protest which His Majesty's Government have made against the appointment is awaited.

[35313] No. 2.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 295.)
(Telegraphic.) R. *Foreign Office, October* 1, 1910.

YOUR telegram No. 209 of 30th September : Illegal action of Vali of Bagdad. Your action approved.

[35562] No. 3.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 2.)

(No. 213.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, October* 2, 1910.

EL ODEID.

With reference to my telegram No. 207, consul has heard from acting vali at Bussorah that he has sent instructions to the Mutessarif of Hassa. The acting vali says that he is ignorant of the whole question, and is not able to say whether the mudir went or not. Sheikh Abu Thabi was instructed a month ago by the resident at Bushire to let him know as soon as the mudir arrived, but up till now he has not done so.

[35633] No. 4.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 3.)

(No. 681 Confidential.)

Sir, *Constantinople, September* 23, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Damascus, reporting that the Druzes appear to be disposed to submit to the Turkish authorities provided the latter should in future effectively protect them against the Bedouin, and that they would like to have the Turks promise to that effect guaranteed by some foreign Power or Powers.

Mr. Devey reported to me by telegraph the request made to him on behalf of Yahia Bey Atrash for British intervention, and I replied that he should hold no communications with the sheikh's agents.

Present indications point to a peaceable settlement of the Druze question.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 4.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 43. Confidential.)

Sir, *Damascus, September* 9, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to state that various reports as to the Druzes being genuinely desirous not to resist the armed force which is making, I believe final, preparations under Sami Pasha to move into the Jebel and occupy and reorganise under martial law the whole district, would appear to be true and correct as regards the majority of their sheikhs and notables, and they would even be ready to lay down their arms and accept the terms Government proposes to exact, provided they could feel assured that then in their defenceless state they would be efficiently protected, and that in a lasting way, against the fierce aggression of armed Bedouins, their enemies.

In districts to the south of this city and bordering on the Hauran I hear between 2,000 and 3,000 men of the tribe Sbaa and Wuled Ali, Beni Khaled, and Fedaan are assembled, intending to follow on after the troops shall have advanced from Deraa and harry and plunder, and recently it was announced by Tewfik Effendi-el-Mejali, a Turkish deputy from Kerak, that Arab Bashi-Bazouks there wished to volunteer with the troops on the expedition, but these offers were rejected.

The Druzes in fact wished to have something more solid than the mere Turkish promise that they will be in perfect safety, and would ask for some foreign Powers to guarantee the promise.

In the same way, about a week ago, a local newspaper asserted that Yahia Bey Atrash, one of the chief sheikhs, was about to surrender unconditionally, and certain friends of his, whose names actually cannot be revealed, have approached this consulate in the hope that British intervention might be obtained (or possibly British or French), to the effect that if Yahia Bey Atrash were to submit unconditionally his life would be assured to him. He does not even say "life and personal immunity" (though I assume that such would be expected) or "life and property," and he is wealthy.

I thereupon conferred with M. Piat, the French consul-general, and we considered that both in the public interest of all parties and in the hope of avoiding unnecessary bloodshed it might be well if we could be authorised to make some representations on the subject to the vali and commandant of the Vth Army Corps, but that it would be inadvisable to take any steps without reference to our respective embassies.

I heard also that several weeks ago some indirect request had been preferred to the Russian consul here to get his Government to intervene on the Druze question, but that he had been unable to see his way to do so. However, we thought it better on the whole not to disclose the matter to our colleague at present, but to observe prudent secrecy, thereby ensuing greater hopes of a successful intervention if any is to be made.

There is rather too much mutual distrust on both sides between the Government and the Druzes, though it must be allowed that this mistrust has its foundation on promises frequently broken and various deeds of chicanery, or worse.

As things stand, one may reckon that the Druzes will perhaps endeavour to secrete and keep a certain number of their rifles and will furnish conscripts most reluctantly, but in other respects will keep good faith; while the Turks should on their part respect scrupulously Druze manners and customs (in so far as not incompatible with law and administration), and most carefully abstain from interfering with the professed faith, for a suggestion has been made, though I think it utterly incredible and probably malicious, that the Turks would soon be trying to drive the Druzes into the fold of Islam.

I have, &c.

G. P. DEVEY.

[35634] No. 5.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 3.)

(No. 682.)

Sir, *Constantinople, September* 22, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 17 of the 7th January, I have the honour to state that the Russian Ambassador has since that date continued to interest himself in the project of the concession for the Samsoun-Sivas Railway, and, encouraged perhaps by renewed official statements that no decision had been taken, but that the matter was still being studied, has brought himself to believe that the Ottoman Government could not do otherwise than resort finally to a Franco-Russian syndicate for the necessary capital for the construction of the line.

A decision has, however, now been taken by the Cabinet in precisely an opposite sense, namely, that the Turkish Government have decided to build the line themselves "en régie" and without appealing to any foreign capitalists for the necessary funds.

The process will be slow, but it is difficult to see how the Russian Government can, under their secret agreement, make any objection to it.

Loans for general purposes will be required and will be raised, and the Ottoman Government may, in its budget, set aside a small sum yearly for the construction, under the heading of general public works.

To establish a practical opposition to any further demands for the concession it has been decided to begin at once a small section of about 30 kiloms.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

[35639] No. 6.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 3.)

(No. 687.)

Sir, *Constantinople, September* 27, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 642, and to previous correspondence on the subject of the question of the Capitulations at Damascus, I have the honour to transmit herewith copies of two further despatches from His Majesty's consul, reporting the joint action taken by the consular body at Damascus in consequence of the irregularities complained of. As a result of this action the vali promised to give orders that no more irregularities such as had been complained of should occur, pending the receipt of instructions from Constantinople, and also undertook to reform the recently reorganised police force.

The fact remains, however, that the questions raised by the action of the Damascus authorities are very thorny ones on which there is small likelihood that an agreement will be reached between the Turkish authorities and the foreign consular corps.

The main points raised by the Damascus head of the police are:—

1. The question of "preventive imprisonment"; and
2. The right of the Turks to enter foreign establishments other than the actual residences of foreigners, *e.g.*, churches, shops, factories, &c.

The first point has always been claimed as a right by the Porte, and sometimes successfully contested by the foreign missions; though we have in some cases practically admitted the Turkish claim. The second has also been claimed by the Turks, but generally ceded by them in practice.

The recent action of the Damascus police is contrary in spirit to the circular of the Grand Vizier (copy sent home in my despatch No. 94 of the 18th February last) which instructed the provincial authorities to observe all clear stipulations of the Capitulations and established practice. In Damascus the established practice was the opposite of these claims of the head of the police who is evidently, on inspiration, trying to insert the thin edge of the wedge—a process that ought to be strenuously resisted.

As reported in my above-mentioned despatch, I have instructed His Majesty's consul at Damascus, to avoid discussion for the present on this question, unless a special occasion should arise necessitating discussion.

I have had a lengthy conversation with Rifaat Pasha on this subject without, at present, obtaining any definite result, but I shall renew the conversation at an early opportunity.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 6.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 40.)

Sir, *Damascus, September 3, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to report that yesterday afternoon the Russian consul and Austrian acting vice-consul and I met M. Piat at the French consulate-general by his request, to discuss matters of general interest, the French vice-consul and the ex-consul-general, M. Collomb, being also present.

The chauvinistic and anti-foreign attitude of local authorities, as specially manifested in the behaviour of the police, was the subject.

M. Piat informed us of the following incidents:—

1. On the 27th instant, a quarrel having taken place between two young Christian natives in the chief bazaar, Souk Hamidieh, one of them entered the shop of his employer, M. Habra, a French-protected person, and, besides that qualification, the vekil (or agent) for the local Lazarist Mission, which position entitles the holder to French protection. Although M. Habra protested strongly, the police entered by force and dragged off the culprit to prison, amid vociferations of the populace, "Long live the constitution! Down with the French! Down with Europeans!" Reparation has been promised as regards a reprimand and punishment of the agents who forced the shop of M. Habra, while two parties are to be brought to justice for the tumultuous cries raised against French and Europeans.

2. But scarcely had the above incident taken place than another of the same nature followed it. Briefly, on the 31st ultimo, on account of some dispute as to rights of water, a muezzin of Bâbsa quarter of the city came to the house of an Algerian named Merabet and commenced an altercation, and police, being handy, were at once summoned, to whom the Algerian produced his French passport. This appeal for consular intervention instantly provoked furious opposition. Policeman No. 68 declared they cared nothing for the foreign consulates, and an army officer, Emin Effendi, a neighbour, upheld this view, and a small crowd again vociferated insults against each individual consulate they happened to know, while the policeman declared that foreigners, whether wearing hat or fez, should be dragged "like donkeys" to the prison, using an offensive term for donkey—"jahish"—and presumably implying with blows and kicks. The muezzin tried to stir fanaticism by urging that the flowing water was part property of the mosque and its theft deserved death, and had the accused been a non-Moslem the issue might have been serious. The declarations of the police on the spot as to disregard and non-admission of consular intervention were repeated a little later by another policeman to the French cavass in the police office itself.

Yesterday morning the head of the police, Nafiz Bey (who replaced Ruhi Bey several weeks ago, and who was transferred from Beirout after an incident of an arrest made at the Greek Orthodox church during the Greek Easter), called at this consulate (but I was absent at the time and did not see him), and at the Russian and French consulates, and, I am informed, announced orally that he should in future—

1. Proceed to arrest, without reference to the consulate concerned, any foreigner found *in flagrante delicto* of "crime, délit, contravention," and when it might be urgent to effect immediate arrest.

2. Conduct such offender direct to the police office—not to the consulate.
3. Simply inform the consul of such arrest.
4. Enter, without announcement to consulate, any public establishment kept by foreigners, excepting only their actual residence.

In my despatch No. 28 of the 12th July I suggested that a tendency to xenophoby exists at Damascus, and now may add that was rather to be observed among the Government and local officials than in the mass of the people; but, clearly open disrespect and disconsideration for Europeans on the part of the police and of those in authority will quickly inspire wanton acts of aggression on the part of the populace; trifling instances have already occurred, and little acts of insolence by children unrestrained by their parents, or unchecked by adult bystanders constantly occur (as has ever been the case) in certain quarters of Damascus, especially those where the "hat-wearers" are seldom seen. The sad murder of M. Ungern at Haifa a few weeks ago is an instance in point.

The above action of the police in entering houses of French subjects find a recent parallel in an attempted but interrupted entry and search of a Belgian's house at Damascus without any notification given to that consulate.

Three weeks ago a search for arms was made at the Druze village, Jermana, 2 miles from Damascus. Being on the outskirts of the village, one of the first houses entered was that of the Druze cavass of this consulate, at very early dawn, in spite of his protest, to which no attention was paid. The search was irregularly conducted, inasmuch as the village mukhtar was not present with the officer conducting it. Except for the present phase of police demeanour, I should not have cited this instance, as the two guns taken from the cavass's house were promptly restored after my intervention next day, and because the search was made decently and properly to the best of my belief—at least without complaint raised by the villagers. Some fifty soldiers, besides a few policemen, were employed all day searching, but found one prohibited rifle only with a few cartridges, besides a large number of muzzle-loading shot-guns, which were confiscated at the time, but restored to their owners a few days later.

Serious matters of complaint by this consulate against the conduct of the vali are (1) the recent detention of two British Indians; (2) the seizure of Miss Elverson's bell; (3) the prevention of the Danish missionary, Dr. Fox Maule, buying a piece of land at Nebk (*vide* my despatch No. 53 of the 14th December last).

In this last affair the vali acted with bad faith. After making hypocritical promises that he was not ill-disposed towards this medical mission nor would hinder the proposed purchase, he went to Nebk at the end of last year and called and threatened those who had proposed selling, and publicly denounced any who assisted Europeans to settle on Turkish territories.

In respect of Miss Elverson's bell, he most insolently persisted in repeating to the dragoman that it would be returned to her not as a bell, but as a "kitchen utensil," on both the last occasions that the dragoman has had to interview him on the matter.

When the political director, Fakhr-ed-Din Effendi, was here last spring (rumours of his offensiveness towards various members of the consular body at Aleppo are now arriving here) it was sometimes averred that the late vali, Nazim Pasha, had been dominated by that functionary's blatant bullying propensities and afterwards that Ismail Fadil Pasha disapproved of his insolence and anti-foreign doings, but was unable to combat the powerful private influence which upheld him from Constantinople. But since the spring, after Fakhr-ed-Din's disappearance from the scene, it is evident that the present vali shows a similar inclination to trample openly on the rights of foreign consulates, and to render them of no effect by his public acts, seeking thus to undermine the Capitulations.

It is not within my sphere to offer remarks upon the Capitulations, their advantages or drawbacks as regards Turkey under constitutional condition; my colleagues and self feel convinced that it is our duty to uphold existing treaties, and therefore we propose at an early opportunity to make a joint visit to his Excellency the vali and enquire whether the chief of police was authorised to make the foregoing communications, and whether he approves of that officer's course of conduct generally, and to make complaints as to various irregularities.

I have, &c.
G. P. DEVEY.

Enclosure 2 in No. 6.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Louther.

(No. 42.)

Damascus, September 8, 1910.

Sir,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 40 of the 3rd instant, I now have the honour to submit copies of the *procès-verbal* signed by the consuls of France, Russia, myself, and of Austria, showing the manner of our joint visit to his Excellency the vali, to make complaint as to local police irregularities.

I have, &c.

G. P. DEVEY.

Enclosure 3 in No. 6.

Procès-verbal.

NOUS soussignés, représentants à Damas d'Autriche-Hongrie de France, de Grande-Bretagne, et de Russie, après avoir examiné la situation intolérable dans laquelle mettaient nos ressortissants les agissements des agents de la force publique (zaptiés et agents de police) ; après nous être convaincus que les incidents regrettables auxquels ont donné lieu les arrestations arbitraires opérées sans le concours de nos consulats, et la violation des domiciles de plusieurs de nos ressortissants ainsi que la violation d'une chapelle grecque et d'une école protestante; après nous être assurés que ces faits intolérables excitaient le fanatisme et les sentiments de xénophobie des indigènes musulmans non seulement contre les Européens, mais aussi contre les chrétiens sujets ottomans ; enfin, après nous être concertés à deux reprises différentes et avoir acquis la certitude que différer plus longtemps une démarche du corps consulaire auprès de son Excellence le Vali de Syrie pour attirer son attention la plus sérieuse sur les méfaits des agents de la force publique serait nous exposer, nous, nos ressortissants, tous les étrangers ainsi que les chrétiens de Damas à de réels dangers, nous nous sommes rendus aujourd'hui, le 6 septembre, à 3 heures 30 de l'après-midi, auprès de son Excellence Ismaïl Fazil Pacha, au Séraï, où étant nous lui avons demandé si c'était par son ordre que le mudir de la police, Nafiz Bey, s'était présenté aux consulats de France, de Grande-Bretagne, et de Russie pour nous signifier qu'il arrêterait les étrangers sans le concours consulaire, qu'il les conduirait directement au poste et qu'il se bornerait simplement à prévenir leurs consuls de leur arrestation ; qu'il pourrait, en outre, pénétrer dans les immeubles occupés par des étrangers sans autorisation préalable de notre part. A cette question le vali a répondu qu'il n'avait pas envoyé Nafiz Bey auprès du corps consulaire, et qu'il lui donnerait des ordres pour n'arrêter désormais aucun étranger sans l'intervention consulaire, sauf en cas de flagrant délit pour les crimes ; et qu'en attendant les ordres de la Porte, qu'il allait provoquer, il obligerait provisoirement le directeur de la police à se conformer à la procédure suivie jusqu'à ce jour, c'est-à-dire, à conduire directement à leurs consulats respectifs les étrangers qui viendraient à être arrêtés, sans les conduire au préalable au poste de police ; qu'en aucun cas il ne l'autoriserait à violer les immeubles occupés par des ressortissants étrangers.

A l'exposé que nous lui avions fait des actes arbitraires commis quotidiennement par les agents de police, le vali a répondu qu'il prenait l'engagement de procéder à la réforme de la police en opérant au fur et à mesure le changement des agents dont il a reconnu les procédés brutaux. Il a également admis que cette police, qui venait d'être tout récemment organisée, laisse beaucoup à désirer.

Lui ayant signalé la mauvaise conduite d'Osman Bey, sous-chef de la police, et du Colonel Aghasi, Aarif Bey, sous-chef de la gendarmerie, il nous a promis de procéder à une enquête sérieuse sur ces agents et de faire d'autant plus le nécessaire pour réprimer leurs agissements qu'il était au courant des méfaits d'Aarif Bey.

Il a également pris l'engagement de donner des ordres sévères à la police pour que les insultes adressées à des Européens dans les rues soient rigoureusement réprimées. Il a, en outre, réitéré les excuses qu'il avait adressées à M. Piat pour les insultes proférées par la foule à l'égard des Européens, lors de l'incident Habra, au Souk-Hamidié, le 27 août, 1910.

Ismaïl Fazil Pacha a rappelé qu'il avait puni d'une peine disciplinaire les gendarmes qui avaient pénétré sans autorisation du consul général de France dans le magasin de M. Habra et qu'il allait les déférer aux tribunaux, ainsi que les provocateurs du tumulte du 27 août dernier. Il a exprimé ses regrets que le poste de police et celui du

Muchiriet ne soient pas sortis pour faire cesser le scandale provoqué au Souk-Hamidié, et au cours duquel les Puissances étrangères, et notamment la France, ont été insultées; mais il a donné pour excuse que ces postes étaient trop éloignés du lieu de l'incident. Nous avons cru alors devoir lui faire remarquer qu'ils n'étaient situés qu'à 100 et 130 mètres tout au plus de l'endroit ou l'incident s'est produit.

Il a notifié enfin que l'agent de police qui, le 1er septembre, 1910, avait illégalement arrêté M. Marabet, avait été puni de deux jours de prison et qu'il l'avait envoyé en disgrace de Kerek. Il a, en outre, promis que le muezzin, cause première de l'incident Marabet, serait puni.

Ayant considéré d'un commun accord que les engagements pris par le vali, s'ils étaient tenus, assureraient le maintien de l'ordre et le respect des traités en vigueur, nous nous sommes retirés du Séraï après avoir remercié son Excellence Ismaïl Fazil Pacha d'avoir accordé satisfaction aux demandes que nous lui avions adressées.

Après avoir quitté le Séraï et avant de nous séparer, nous nous sommes engagés à demander à nos ambassades respectives qu'elles veuillent bien obtenir de la Porte :—

1. La révocation ou tout au moins le déplacement immédiat de Nafiz Bey, le directeur de la police, et celui d'Osman Bey, sous-chef de la police.

2. Et le maintien du principe de l'arrestation des étrangers à Damas par les agents de la force publique (zaptiés ou agents de police) uniquement avec le concours consulaire, sauf dans les cas de flagrant délit pour crimes ou tout au moins que, dans aucun cas, nos ressortissants ne puissent être emmenés au poste de police ou à la direction de la police sans avoir été conduits préalablement au consulat dont ils se seront réclamés. Les agents de la force publique se distinguent, en effet, à Damas par leur brutalité et les mauvais traitements qu'ils infligent aux individus qu'ils arrêtent, et ces faits ne permettent pas que nous ayions confiance dans leur modération.

Fait à Damas, en quadruple exemplaire, le 6 septembre, 1910.

[35640] No. 7.

Sir G. Louther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 3.)

(No. 688.)

Constantinople, September 27, 1910.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from Mr. Crow, His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, reporting on a decision of the Council of State that the Sheikh of Mohammerah shall be allowed to register no more land in Turkish territory.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 7.

Consul Crow to Sir G. Louther.

(No. 51.)

Bussorah, August 26, 1910.

Sir,

I LEARN that the Council of State has recently decreed that, in future, no more land in the Bussorah vilayet is to be registered in the name of Sheikh Khazal of Mohammerah, or in the names of Mirza Hamza or his clerk, Mollah Mustafa. The two latter have for some years past been in charge of the Sheikh of Mohammerah's interests at Bussorah.

Orders have been issued to the vilayet accordingly. No particular reason is assigned for this decision, but it is presumed that the Turks are still afraid of Sheikh Khazal's influence, and are therefore anxious to limit his tenure of land in this district as much as possible.

I have, &c.

E. E. CROW.

[35641] No. 8.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 3.)

(No. 689.)
Sir, *Constantinople, September 27, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 681, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from Mr. Devey, His Majesty's consul at Damascus, reporting further on the situation in the Hauran.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 8.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 44.)
Sir, *Damascus, September 12, 1910.*

I HEARD yesterday that the Druzes were lighting their beacon fires, the signal of assembly for bellicose purpose, but it is not clearly stated where lighted, presumably in the region of Jebel Druze, whereas according to ancient usage the highest peaks of Hermon (Jebel Sheikh) are by established rule the unique spot for beacons signifying the call to arms addressed to all Druzes.

A local newspaper to-day states that most of the Druzes are sending their wives and children and effects to Lebanon from Sheikh-Meskin Station. Also that the director of the French railway made an agreement with some Druzes for a certain sum of money to start a special train to convey them to Aley and Sofar; this agreement is for one month only. Other Druzes have gone to Rashaya and Jeraniana.

These items of news indicate that the Druzes fear that the Turks will accept of only unconditional submission, and therefore that they will be compelled to fight, though they seem to understand clearly that they cannot oppose effectual resistance.

Fathi Pasha went to Dera three days ago to inspect the troops, and Sami Pasha is expected to return here from Haifa very shortly before any advance shall be made from Dera, where the thirty-one battalions now assembled have broken camp and spread over a wider and more salubrious area.

I have, &c.
G. P. DEVEY.

[35806] No. 9.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 3.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 2nd October, relative to the Turkish mudir for El Odeid.

India Office, October 3, 1910.

Enclosure in No. 9.

Government of India to Viscount Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P. *October 2, 1910.*

WITH reference to your telegram of the 28th ultimo:

The political agent at Bahrein is making enquiries, but the resident, Bushire, has reason to suppose that the mudir has not yet arrived.

[35822] No. 10.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 3.)

(No. 215.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, October 3, 1910.*

ILLEGAL expropriation of British subjects at Bagdad.

With reference to my telegram No. 209:

The Sublime Porte have advised me to instruct His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad to suggest that the plaintiffs should bring actions against vali in local courts, Rifaat Pasha even stating that they could not control his Excellency in such matters. I fear, however, that aggrieved parties could not expect a fair hearing and decision in their respective cases, as Mr. Lorimer reports to me to-day in a private and confidential telegram that the local authorities show a hostile and tyrannical attitude towards all foreigners, and that the vali's government is one which might almost be called anarchical. Mr. Lorimer lays stress on the imperative necessity for His Majesty's Government to use the strongest measures to protect British interests and British subjects, and adds that never have safeguards been more wanted than under present régime at Bagdad.

[35987] No. 11.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 4.)

(No. 217.)
Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, October 4, 1910.*

PLEASE see my despatch No. 681 of the 23rd ultimo, referring to troubles in the Hauran.

General Sami Pasha, who is now at Dera, caused Yahia Atrash, one of the principal Druse leaders, who came to visit him, to be arrested and brought before court-martial. His Majesty's consul at Damascus reports that fighting ensued, and in a telegram sent yesterday he states that the Turks have taken a number of Druse villages, and that many Druses have been killed. In Mr. Devey's opinion the Druses will not offer a long resistance. He adds that the Bedouins are observing an attitude of neutrality.

[36016] No. 12.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 5.)

(No. 694.)
Sir, *Constantinople, September 30, 1910.*

AS reported to you in my telegram No. 197 of the 21st instant, I postponed sending in a written protest in consequence of the appointment of a mudir at El Odeid by the Turkish authorities at Bussorah, as instructed in your telegram No. 279 of the 20th instant, in order to give Rifaat Pasha the opportunity to make a communication to me on the subject, as he had promised to do within a few days.

As no such communication had reached me on the 24th instant, I on that day sent in the written protest, copy of which is enclosed herewith for your information. On the 28th, as reported in my telegram No. 206 of that date, Rifaat Pasha assured me that the Minister of the Interior had no knowledge of any such appointment having been made. Rifaat Pasha added that his Excellency had telegraphed to the Bussorah authorities instructing them not to make any such appointment, and to cancel it if it had already been made.

I asked Rifaat Pasha whether the Vali of Bussorah has any authority to make such an appointment. His Excellency replied that he did not know, but that in any case he had no funds with which to pay him.

I have telegraphed to His Majesty's consul at Bussorah to ascertain if possible whether any instructions in the above sense have been received by the authorities there.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 12.

Note by Sir G. Lowther.

EN 1904 un mudir ottoman a été nommé à l'endroit dit El Wakra, dans le Golfe Persique, mais cette nomination a été rapportée. Il paraît que dernièrement les autorités du vilayet de Bassora ont nommé un mudir à El Odeïd, qui est situé au sud-est d'El Wakra et forme partie du territoire des "chefs de trêve" qui jouissent de la protection du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique. Il est évident alors que ce dernier ne peut pas reconnaître la nomination en question, et l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté britannique a, par conséquent, l'honneur de prier la Sublime Porte d'aviser sans délai aux mesures nécessaires pour la révocation du fonctionnaire dont il s'agit.

Constantinople, le 24 septembre, 1910.

Presented to Rifaat Pasha to-day through Dicran Bey, whom I informed for Rifaat Pasha's information that this communication, and especially the request for "immediate recall," was made by orders from His Majesty's Government.

G. H. Fitzmaurice.

September 24, 1910.

[32854] No. 13.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, October* 5, 1910.

WITH reference to recent correspondence, I am directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to transmit to you, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, the accompanying draft of a despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople respecting the vexatious treatment of British subjects in Asiatic Turkey, and the number of incidents of political aggression which have recently marked the conduct of the Ottoman authorities in the region of the Persian Gulf.

Sir E. Grey would be glad to be furnished with the observations of Viscount Morley respecting the terms of this despatch.

Sir E. Grey is of opinion that, although the incident respecting the alleged intention of the Vali of Bagdad to interfere with the grounds of His Majesty's Consulate-General is closed, it would be better not to allow the matter to pass without some comment, as it may be reopened at any time.

With regard to the appointment of a Turkish mudir at El Odeid, Sir E. Grey considers that reference to this subject might perhaps be omitted if the enquiries which have been instituted locally show that the official in question has not proceeded to El Odeid; on the other hand, it might be expedient to communicate to the Ottoman Government a clear statement of the claims of His Majesty's Government on the subject.

In this connection, I am to draw your attention to a statement made by Sir G. Lowther in his despatch No. 603 of the 22nd August (of which a copy has already been sent to your department) that there now appears to be no longer any objection to the conclusion of a treaty, as desired by the Government of India in 1904, with a sheikh of the El Katr Peninsular, and I am to request that Sir E. Grey may be furnished with Lord Morley's views on the subject.

It will be observed that Sir G. Lowther further raises the point as to whether the withdrawal of the Turkish post at El Bidaa should be insisted upon.

Sir E. Grey is disposed not to raise the question of El Bidaa, where there has been a Turkish garrison since 1872 (although as you are aware, His Majesty's Government have never admitted the Turkish claim to El Katr), unless it should be necessary to use force at El Odeid and at Zakhmuniyeh Island. Should it be necessary to use force at those places, then the question of El Bidaa might be reconsidered.

With regard to the difficulty which has arisen in relation to the Sheikh of Koweit's Fedaghia property, I am to suggest that, if the enquiries which are now being made

[36239] No. 13.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 6.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 29th September, relative to Abu Musa.

India Office, October 6, 1910.

Enclosure in No. 13.

Government of India to Viscount Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P. *September 29, 1910.*

ABU MUSA. Please see your telegram dated the 22nd instant.

I have received the following telegram, dated the 27th September, from the resident, Persian Gulf:—

"With reference to your telegram of the 23rd September, a complication has lately arisen through Salim's temporary secession from the control of Sheikh Sagar, in connection with case of murder at Ras-el-Kheimah. Salim was acting governor at that place on behalf of Sheikh Sagar. With a view to taking up the present matter I visited them both last month, but I found it inexpedient and impracticable to discuss the Abu Musa case then owing to the relations existing between the uncle and the nephew. The two sheikhs were mutually distrustful and resentful, and neither ventured to leave his head-quarters, since the pearling season was at its height, when most of their dependents are at the pearl banks. Sheikh Sagar was informed by me that when the season—now approaching its conclusion—was ended I should be ready to tender my good offices with the object of bringing back Salim to the fold. In connection with the Abu Musa case it is of considerable importance that the previous position and accord between the two should be re-established, and my best endeavours shall be directed to this end. I had, however, rather hoped that by adopting the course suggested last February the matter might have been simplified in the meantime. I will in every possible way expedite the collection of material, but I am afraid that in any case several weeks must elapse before it can be placed before Government."

Please refer to paragraphs 537 and 644 of the Persian Gulf Residency Diaries for June and July last respectively, in connection with the case of murder at Ras-el-Kheimah referred to by the resident. They form enclosures to the weekly letters from the Foreign Secretary dated the 28th July and 1st September.

---

should show that that difficulty has disappeared with the recall of the late Vali of Bussorah, it might be prudent to omit all reference to this question.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[35822] No. 14.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 304.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, October 6, 1910.*

ILLEGAL action of Vali of Bagdad.

We cannot regard Rifaat Pasha's statements (reported in your telegram No. 215 of the 3rd October) as satisfactory, amounting as they do to a practical admission of the Central Government's inability to rule in the provinces.

You should tell him that His Majesty's Government must continue to hold the Porte responsible for the acts of minor officials, and in cases where injury is done to British subjects, will claim compensation. As things now stand, recourse to the local courts is quite useless.

[36372] No. 15.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 7.)

Sir, *India Office, October 7, 1910.*

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for India to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, inviting his observations on the terms of a draft despatch which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs proposes to address to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople on the subject of some recent manifestations of Turkish policy in Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf.

As will have been inferred from my letter of the 24th August last, Viscount Morley is in entire accord with Sir E. Grey in thinking that the time has come when it is necessary to give the Turkish Government a sharp reminder of the interests of Great Britain and India in those regions, and, subject to the following remarks, he concurs in the draft despatch.

He agrees with Sir E. Grey that the alleged intention of the Vali of Bagdad to interfere with the premises of His Majesty's consulate should not be passed over; and, in connection with the question of expropriations, he thinks that reference might be made to the incidents at Kerbela and Kazimin reported in Sir G. Lowther's telegram No. 209 of the 29th ultimo, and an expression added to the effect that His Majesty's Government cannot be expected to acquiesce in the helplessness professed by the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, as reported in Sir G. Lowther's telegram No. 215 of the 3rd October.

With reference to the second paragraph on p. 2 of the draft, it has no doubt not been overlooked that Mr. Lorimer describes his visit to the president of the municipality as "private," and that gentleman's remarks as having been made in "confidence" (Summary for July 1910, p. 16). It is apprehended that some inconvenience might arise if they were quoted in an official communication.

As regards Odeid, Lord Morley agrees with Sir E. Grey that no reference should be made to the incident if local enquiry shows that the mudir has not gone there; but he would suggest that the passage on p. 4 beginning "I do not propose to enter" down to the bottom of the page might, in that case, conveniently be preserved and inserted in the section relating to Zakhnuniyah Island. If the Odeid incident is omitted, the two paragraphs dealing with El Katr on p. 5 will cease to be relevant; and it is for consideration in any case whether the paragraph on p. 4 beginning "Moreover an authoritative writer" is worth inserting. Lord Morley fears that an appeal to "native annals" might easily lead to unexpected and inconvenient results.

His Lordship agrees that it would be prudent to refrain from mentioning the Sheikh of Koweit's difficulties in connection with the registration of his properties at Fadaghia if they are found to have disappeared on the recall of the vali. Perhaps, too, that official should be referred to throughout as the "late vali."

Finally, Lord Morley ventures to suggest that more emphasis would perhaps be given to the views of His Majesty's Government if paragraphs 2 and 3 on p. 1 were

transferred to the end of the despatch, or else another paragraph to the same effect added at the end by way of conclusion.

As regards the conclusion of a treaty with a Katr sheikh, which Lord Morley understands that Sir E. Grey does not in any case propose to deal with on the present occasion, reference will be made to the Government of India, and a further communication addressed to you. His Lordship agrees also that the question of El Bidan would more conveniently be reserved.

I am, &c.
R. RITCHIE.

[36536] No. 16.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 10.)

(No. 702.)
Sir, *Constantinople, October 5, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 671 of the 21st ultimo, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, submitting copy of a letter which he has addressed to the Government of India on the subject of the attempt to cut through the residency grounds.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 16.

Consul-General Lorimer to Government of India.

(No. 772.)
Sir, *Bagdad, September 3, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to submit, in continuation of my letter No. 730 of the 22nd August, 1910, a copy of a communication which I made to the political secretary of the Bagdad vilayet on the 24th August, 1910, in regard to a threatened encroachment by the Turkish local authorities upon the precincts of this residency. The occasion of this letter was a private request made to me on the evening of the 23rd August on a steamer excursion organized by his Excellency the vali, that I should report to His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople that the whole question of interference with the residency had arisen in consequence of a misunderstanding, presumably on my part.

As the Government of India will observe, I have been careful to rebut this suggestion, which to me seems to argue a guilty consciousness on the part of the Turkish authorities. Everyone in Bagdad, whether European or native, believes that some sort of *coup de main* against this residency had been prepared; and in view of the remarks which have been—and continue to be—made to me by various foreigners and persons in a position to know the real intentions of the Turks, I can only congratulate myself on having brought the matter to notice in time to avert a very disagreeable incident.

I have, &c.
J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 2 in No. 16.

Consul-General Lorimer to M. Eram Bey.

(Private.)
Dear M. Eram Bey, *Bagdad, August 24, 1910.*

THIS refers to what you said to me yesterday evening about the British consulate-general grounds and the new street.

I am not aware of any misunderstanding (*malentendu*) on my own part, but I am satisfied that there is not now any intention of interfering with our buildings or grounds, and I have telegraphed to the British Ambassador at Constantinople that the matter should be buried in oblivion.

Yours very truly,
J. G. LORIMER.

[36537] No. 17.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 10.)

(No. 703.)
Sir *Constantinople, October 5, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 600 of the 23rd August last, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's acting consul at Jeddah, reporting on the movements of the Grand Shereef of Mecca and on the state of affairs in the Hedjaz.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 17.

Acting Consul Abdur Rahman to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 49.)
Sir, *Jeddah, September 17, 1910.*

IN continuation of my despatch No. 44 of the 5th August, 1910, re state of affairs in the Hedjaz, I have the honour to report that the news about the Grand Shereef of Mecca are very scarce. However, from a telegram received here from the Grand Shereef's son, who is acting for him at Taif, it appears that the Grand Shereef reached a place called Cassim, and has succeeded in catching one Saad, brother of Abdul Aziz-bin-Saoud.

As soon as I am able to gather details of the Grand Shereef's movements I will report for your Excellency's information.

I have, &c.
S. ABDUR RAHMAN.

[36538] No. 18.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 10.)

(No. 704.)
Sir, *Constantinople, October 5, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 673 of the 21st ultimo, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, forwarding a copy of a pamphlet regarding the administration of the Vali of Bagdad, Nazim Pasha, together with a note showing the attitude of the Nakib's family. If that account is true, the vali must be about as popular with the Turkish Ministers as with the foreign consular body, but I fear it is quite likely that his Excellency's irregularities have been dictated from here.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 18.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 770/39.)
Your Excellency, *Bagdad, September 3, 1910.*

IN continuation of my letter of the 22nd August, 1910, I have the honour to report that two batches of the pamphlets against Nazim Pasha, of which a free translation was forwarded to your Excellency, arrived in the British Post Office at Bagdad, possibly from Aden,* on the 26th August. The larger packet was addressed to the "Al Fakhri Seyyids of Musal," and the other to the newspaper "Zuhur" at Bagdad. Together they contained twenty-three copies. In the ordinary course of business the former packet would have been transferred to the Turkish Post Office for delivery to the addressees at Musal, and the latter handed to the addressee at Bagdad on his calling for it; but, as the pamphlets contained a bitter attack upon the present local govern-

* The post-marks are illegible, except the date of posting on one, which is the 11th August. The stamps are British-Indian.

ment, I have thought it better for political reasons to impound them. They were not registered; and in any case it is most unlikely that enquiries about their non-delivery will be made by the unknown senders.*

The same mail brought copies of the "Umran" newspaper (Egypt), containing criticisms of Nazim Pasha;† but these, as the journal in question is not on the prohibited list, I have allowed to go forward.

I may add that I have done and am still doing my utmost, so far as is consistent with the proper protection of British interests, to preserve good relations with the Vali of Bagdad. I have invariably shown the greatest respect for his Excellency, both on public occasions and in private society; my correspondence with him has been conducted with studious moderation; and I have used all the means in my power to prevent the existence of any official differences between us from becoming known. In the last endeavour, however, it appears that I have not been successful—witness a curious report, from a sure source, which is subjoined to this despatch.‡ This report also illustrates the attitude of the Nakib of Bagdad's family towards Nazim Pasha, which, owing, to the vali's having attempted summarily to reduce the Nakib to a nonentity, is, of course, very antagonistic.

I have, &c.

J. G. LORIMER, I. C. S.,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

Annexure (B).

I met Seyyid Mahmud Effendi (the eldest son of the Nakib), the day before yesterday and dined with him. We sat up late into the night and discussed all the current topics relating to the vali.

Seyyid Mahmud informed me, smilingly, that the present fight going on between the British consulate and the vali would result in the benefit of both British and Turkish subjects. I denied§ forcibly the existence of any kind of bad feeling between the British consulate and the vali, and I mentioned to the Seyyid the resident's evening parties at which the vali regularly attends. But he would not believe me, and, strange to say, he gave me very nearly the gist of all the resident's letters‖ to the vali regarding the question of Abdul Ali's ice factories and the demolition of the immovable property of British subjects. However, to the last, I did not admit the truth of his assertions.

Seyyid Mahmud informed me that the vali had now fallen out with nearly all the Ministers at Constantinople, and that he had been reprimanded in several matters. The leading people of Bagdad had, without a single exception, written in his disfavour to their friends at the capital, and the vali's position was day by day becoming more precarious. As an instance he quoted the case of Najm-ud-Din Bey, Minister of Justice and Acting Prime Minister, to whom the vali had written with regard to his intention of punishing certain evil-intentioned persons at Bagdad, and had requested the Minister's support. The Minister wrote back saying that, before replying to the contents of the vali's letter, it was his duty to point out that the proper channel of communication was the Ministry of the Interior, and that the vali had been guilty of a breach of official etiquette. With regard to the punishment of the evil-doers he informed him that he would not be supported merely because he wished support, but that the question would be decided on the basis of the proofs that he furnished, and consequently that his request also was illegal.

Seyyid Mahmud also informed me that the Minister of War, Mahmud Shevket Pasha, was the vali's bitterest enemy; and that that Minister's brother, Murad Bey, formerly secretary to this vilayet, whom Nazim Pasha forced to resign, was going to Constantinople to work further mischief against the latter.

Moreover, the Seyyid said, the Sheikh-ul Islam was also against Nazim Pasha

* One of these impounded pamphlets is enclosed with each copy of this despatch—annexure (A).
† No doubt the work of Abdul Nasih Antaki Bey (see Summary for June, 1910, XII, 1).
‡ Annexure (B).
§ And quite truly. There has not been any breach of private or public relations. When I last saw the vali personally, on the 25th August, he was perfectly courteous, and even friendly; but his manner then for the first time struck me as slightly embarrassed.—J. G. L.
‖ In this residency the correspondence has been treated as strictly confidential; but I have no doubt that there has been leakage of information from the sarai. I hear that for the last few days the vali's correspondence with me has not been seen by the clerks in his office.—J. G. L.

since he had been written to and informed about the vali's unorthodox practices; hence the vali's present orders about the strict observance of Ramadhan. The Seyyid added that these orders were partly due to the efforts of the Yaman people, who had agreed to submit to the Turks on condition that there should be no law but that of Islam in their country, and that, with the exception of the vali and the commander-in-chief there should be no Turkish officers and no administrative departments.* To these terms the Turks agreed and peace was secured.

Seyyid Mahmud said that the vali had lost his position and influence and had become afraid, hence the open declaration which he was now making before people: "That there was only one family who were well-wishers of the Government and that was the Nakib's." This change of tactics on the vali's part, said the Seyyid, was due to his being afraid of the Constantinople people and his wishing to have the Nakib on his side. Seyyid Mahmud laughed here, which meant that the vali's notion of appeasing the Nakib was futile.

X. Y.

September 1, 1910.

[37092] No. 19.

Note respecting Bagdad Premises.—(Communicated by Colonel Picot, October 12, 1910.)

BASING themselves on the allegation that the wall and shops on our property facing the road were unsound, the local authorities at Bagdad suddenly and without notice pulled down this wall and the shops. The consul-general had previously satisfied himself that they were perfectly sound. Inasmuch as our main business office, with all its accessories of machinery, sheds, stores, &c., occupies a considerable portion of the same site, and immediately adjoins the road, it is obvious that in order to widen the road they must take a slice of these main offices, thus destroying the utility of the buildings of which they form part, and necessitating the rebuilding of them. The idea is evidently to do this without paying compensation. The sum involved will be about 2,000*l.*

So far as we have been able to ascertain there is no law in Turkey permitting a municipality to expropriate, without compensation of the owner, a property adjoining a road, in order to widen the road. According to article 8 of the "Corps de Droit ottoman" (Young's translation, Clarendon Press, 1906), if the municipality decide that a street shall in the future be enlarged, any new buildings which may in the future be constructed by the adjoining owners must be put back to the approved width. Recognising this, the municipal authorities pulled down the portion of our premises at present in question on the ground that it was unsound and involved danger to the passers-by. They then counted upon article 8 of the law compelling us to erect a new wall and shops further back from the road at our own expense. It is this purely arbitrary action on their part that we are combating. If it be not successfully resisted, their next step will be to allege that the frontage of our main premises is unsound. In this way they will get all they want without compensation.

The questions which confront the Foreign Office in connection with this case are extremely serious and must come directly home to them. These questions are:—

1. Are they prepared to allow the Turkish Government to take a slice of 4 feet off, for instance, the British Embassy building in Constantinople or any other building in Turkey, the property of the British Government, without paying compensation? It is obvious that in the case of the embassy, and it is probable in the case of the other buildings in other parts of Turkey, that such embassy or other buildings would have to be entirely rebuilt.

2. If the Foreign Office would not be prepared to sanction such action, and would be obliged to resist it on the ground that it was opposed to all civilised practice, is it not clear that in not resisting procedure of this kind in our case they are establishing a precedent which will debar them from resisting it in their own case?

It seems clear from all the despatches which we have received that the consul-general, who has only recently arrived at his post, is looking for instructions, and he

* I do not suppose that there is any truth in this assertion; but it is no doubt to the interest of the Nakib's family, who claim to be authoritative exponents of Arab sentiment in this country, to talk in this way.—J. G. L.

has hitherto refused to take any official action at all. The course we advocated at the first, and which the Foreign Office approved, was that we should erect a temporary fence upon the portion of the property which has been arbitrarily taken away, and maintain it there until the whole question has been settled. It would seem that the consul-general is loath to sanction this course. We hope, therefore, that instructions may be sent from Constantinople authorising its adoption in accordance with the despatch from the Foreign Office dated the 20th August, informing us that Sir G. Lowther had made a vigorous protest to the Turkish Government and had supported the demand for the restoration of the land seized and for the erection of a temporary fence on the site of the former wall.

[37496] No. 20.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 15.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Bushire, dated the 14th October, 1910, relative to the Turkish mudir for El Odeid and the sheikh's Fadughia property.

India Office, October 15, 1910.

Enclosure in No. 20.

First Assistant to the Resident, Persian Gulf, to Viscount Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P. *Bushire, October 14, 1910.*

PLEASE refer to telegram dated the 12th instant from the Secretary of State.

As regards property at Fadhghia, political agent, Koweit's, reply is not expected before the mail of the 17th instant. As regards Wakra and Odeid, no definite information has yet been received by political agent, Bahrein, but it is highly improbable, in the latter's opinion, that mudirs have left Hasa to take up their appointments.

(Repeated to Secretary of State and Resident, Persian Gulf.)

[37526] No. 21.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 17.)

(No. 706.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October 6, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith copies of two despatches which I have received respectively from His Majesty's consular officers at Kharput and Erzeroum on the subject of the American Trans-Anatolian Railway scheme.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 21.

Vice-Consul Matthews to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 36.)

Sir, *Kharput, August 23, 1910.*

IN continuation of my despatch No. 30 of the 8th instant, I have the honour to report, for your Excellency's information, that Mr. J. W. Colt, with his two assistants, M. Kischki (?), a German mining expert, and Kenan Bey, a Turk, whose duty appears to be to interview local officials, proceeded on the 10th instant from Kharput, by way

of the Gioljuk Lake and Arghani Maden, to Diarbekir, whence they departed on the 16th instant for Bitlis. After Bitlis it is intended to visit Van and Mosul.

Mr. Colt has written enthusiastically of the possibilities of the Arghani copper mines. The output of these mines is exported to the United Kingdom; in 1909 45,000*l.* worth of copper was extracted. He regards Diarbekir as the most promising province for exploitation by the projected railway. If coal is discovered, the question of fuel will be simplified. It is hoped that in Mosul it may be possible to use the local petroleum for fuel.

I understand that the Chester group are prepared to finance the proposed Turkish railway from Sivas to Samsun, as it is important that their projected line (Sivas–Diarbekir–Bitlis–Van–Mosul) should be connected with a Black Sea port.

I have, &c.

W. D. W. MATTHEWS.

Enclosure 2 in No. 21.

Consul McGregor to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 70.)

Sir, *Erzeroum, September 19, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch addressed to me by Mr. Safrastian, acting vice-consul at Bitlis, on the subject of the visit paid to that town by Mr. Colt, who is at present engaged in carrying out a survey for the proposed Trans-Anatolian Railway.

I have, &c.

P. J. C. McGREGOR.

Enclosure 3 in No. 21.

Acting Vice-Consul Safrastian to Consul McGregor.

Sir, *Bitlis, September 7, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to report that three weeks ago some American engineers arrived here from Diarbekir on their way to Van and Constantinople through Caucasus.

Mr. W. J. Colt, the head of the commission, stated himself to be the representative of the syndicate of Mr. Chester, the American capitalist, who is now in negotiation with the Turkish Government at Constantinople regarding the conditions of the construction of a Trans-Anatolian railway line between Sivas and Van viâ Kharput–Diarbekir–Bitlis. He further stated to me that in spite of the comments of the Constantinople press as regards the opposition raised by the German Government against the scheme, the negotiations between the Turkish Government and Mr. Chester's syndicate are progressing successfully. Mr. Colt was quite sure that if the Ottoman Parliament during the next session were disposed to approve of and vote the project, they would commence the construction of the line from Samsun and Sivas in next spring and would achieve the whole work in three or four years, building the line by sections. He and his German companion, a prospector, took certain elevations in and in the vicinity of this town, and studied the conditions of commerce and labour.

The positive statements of the above Mr. Colt as regards the construction of a railway line in this semi-barbarian country would lead one to believe that the project may be achieved in the following few years, and that the subsequent development of this country and its resources will bring material prosperity and moral and intellectual uplift to these dark regions.

I have, &c.

A. S. SAFRASTIAN.

[37531]

No. 22.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 17.)

(No. 712.)

Sir,

Pera, October 7, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith two despatches from the acting consul-general at Beirout, the first reporting the murder on the 19th July at Tireh of a member of the German colony at Haifa, the second forwarding, in accordance with my instructions, a report by His Majesty's vice-consul on that colony.

The local press lately reported another attack on a German at Haifa, but the German Ambassador makes light of the affair. Indeed, his Excellency disapproves in general of these colonies, as giving rise to jealousies and consequent trouble.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 22.

Acting Consul-General Wilkie Young to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 39.)

Sir,

Beirout, July 22, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to submit as follows the substance of a report which has just reached me from the British vice-consul at Haifa with regard to the murder of a German at Tireh in that district on the 19th instant.

It appears that on the previous night the murdered body of a Moslem had been found in a field adjacent to some property owned by the German colony at or near Tireh.

Accordingly, on the 19th, the assistant public prosecutor, the municipal doctor, and other officials, with two gendarmes, went out to Tireh to hold an enquiry. The German vice-consul, at the invitation of the local authorities, also attended. He was accompanied by his dragoman and cavass, and by a certain Fritz Ungar, a well-to-do member of the German colony.

While the investigation was proceeding, Fritz Ungar, who seems to have remained outside in a carriage, was attacked by some villagers and shot dead.

The authorities had not sufficient force with them to attempt to arrest the murderer or murderers, and the vice-consul returned at once to Haifa, whence, according to Mr. Abela's report, he telegraphed direct to the German Emperor. Later in the day the mutessarif of Acre arrived with thirty soldiers, and a company has since been sent from here.

There seems to have been bad feeling for some time past between the German colony and the natives of the district, but for the moment no further particulars of this incident and its origin are available. The importance attached to it by the Turkish Government may, however, be gauged by the circumstance that the gun-boat "Berket-Zefar" is under orders to convey the Vali of Beirout to Haifa this afternoon.

I have, &c.

H. E. WILKIE YOUNG.

P.S.—As reported by telegraph, the vali has left for Haifa, Friday, the 22nd July.

H. E. W. Y.

Enclosure 2 in No. 22.

Acting Consul-General Wilkie Young to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 44.)

Sir,

Beirout, September 27, 1910.

IN accordance with the instructions contained in your Excellency's despatch of the 28th July last, I have the honour to transmit herewith a report upon the German colony in Haifa, which has just reached me from Mr. Vice-Consul P. Abela. The delay in complying with your Excellency's instructions is due to the trouble taken in obtaining accurate information. Mr. Abela appears to have obtained his estimates of

the value of the landed property held by the colony from the Government registers, and those of the capital employed in various business concerns from the Ottoman Bank.

The numbers of the German colony in Haifa and neighbourhood are given as 560; the actual value of the property held by them in houses and land is approximately 50,000*l.*, and the capital of those of them who are engaged in business on the spot is put at, roughly, 10,000*l.*

Mr. Abela confirms the reports of the unpopularity of the colony with the natives and local officials. He gives no further information with reference to the crimes which formed the subject of my despatch No. 39 of the 22nd July last, but I learn from other sources that there is reason to anticipate further trouble unless energetic measures are taken. The inhabitants of the village of Tireh, the scene of the murder of Fritz Ungar, have had for many years past an unenviable reputation for lawlessness and fanaticism.

I have, &c.

H. E. WILKIE YOUNG.

Enclosure 3 in No. 22.

Report by Vice-Consul Abela on German Colony at Haifa.

THE German colony was established at Haifa some forty years ago by the Templar Society. The original object of the coming of the members of the colony into Palestine was to prepare the country and the people for the reception of Christ, as the second advent of the Messiah was then supposed to be approaching. There are three other German colonies of the same society in Palestine, viz., at Jaffa, Sarona, an hour distant from Jaffa, and at Jerusalem. But the colony at Haifa is the largest one. It numbers now about 560 persons; 500 of them are Germans from Wurtemberg, the rest are naturalised American subjects of German origin. Two-thirds of them are now of the Templar Society; the other third belongs to the Lutheran Church.

According to the Government books, the German colonists possess 139 buildings, comprising houses, shops, workshops, &c., situated both in the German colony and on Mount Carmel, valued altogether at 925,438 piastres Government money (8,500*l.*) The number of the houses is as given, but their actual value is 80 per cent. more, viz., about 15,000*l.* They possess also 78 constructions, consisting of houses, shops, &c., in the town of Haifa, valued at 508,950 piastres (5,000*l.*) The actual value here also is 80 per cent. more, and would amount to about 9,000*l.*. They possess at Haifa 321 pieces of cultivable land, valued at 607,826 piastres (5,600*l.*), but actually worth about 9,400*l.*. These pieces of land comprise about 1,500 acres. At the village of Tireh, an hour distant from Haifa, they possess 56 pieces of land, valued at 203,249 piastres (1,850*l.*). Here also the actual value is 70 per cent. more, say, 3,100*l.* They comprise about 500 acres. They have also there eight or nine small houses, which may be put at 1,200*l.* Some five years ago some of the German colonists of Haifa bought from Messrs Sursock and Tueni, of Beirout, about 2,500 acres of land, about 15 kilom. to the east of Haifa, at about 12,000*l.*

Those mentioned above are practically the whole immovable property owned by the German colonists of Haifa. It would be desirable perhaps to mention that at the German colony there are 2 hotels, 2 carpenters, 2 saddlers, 2 blacksmiths, 1 shoemaker, 1 tailor, 3 carriage owners, 2 drink-shops, 1 small soap factory, 1 pharmacy (at the town of Haifa) and 2 schools (one boys' school and the other girls). The German Government contributes towards the two schools 3,000 marks a year. At the colony there is a German convent belonging to the Roman Catholic Sisters of St. Charles. They have a hospital and a school for children. The German Government contributes 3,000 marks a year for the school.

There are only five commercial houses at Haifa belonging to German colonists. They only deal in imports. The following are the names of the firms, and the articles they import:—

1. A. Duck and Co. ("Successeurs").—Wood, iron, cement, paint, tile, ironmongery, and preserves. They are the agents of the Khedival Mail Line Steamship Company, and also the agents of the German "Levant line." Capital, 3,000*l.*

2. Scherer and Lange.—Iron and ironmongery. Capital, 1,200*l.*

3. Otto Fisher.—Ironmongery, preserves, hosiery, cloth, and ready-made clothing. Capital, 2,000*l.*

4. Struve and Beck.—Cloth and ready-made clothing, hosiery, ironmongery, and preserves. Capital, 2,500*l.* (Proprietors of this firm are naturalised American subjects.)

5. Schmidt and Keller.—Ironmongery, china, glass, and preserves. Capital, 600*l.*

I put down the capital as estimated by the director of the Imperial Ottoman Bank at Haifa. F. Keller possesses a small wine factory on Mount Carmel. It produces red and white wine. The majority of the colonists work in the land, agriculture is their principal occupation. They are not doing very well, but the increase in the price of land has made their property valuable.

The German colonists are economic people. During the old régime their conduct towards the natives was overbearing. Their claims were far from being fair, and the Government was always ready to comply to their demands. They never pay the tithes of their lands as Ottomans and other foreigners do. Each person estimates himself the value of the tithe of the produce of his land, and pay it to the collector of tithes without allowing him to interfere to verify the quantity of the produce to see if the estimation of the tithe is correct. They are hated by both Christians and Mahommedans. The disturbances in Haifa in 1909 made them to be detested by the Christians, and now the Tireh question made them lose the little sympathy they had with some Mahommedans and the Government officials.

Haifa, September 17, 1910.

[37534] No. 23.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 17.)

(No. 715.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 9, 1910.

IN despatches I have at times alluded to Pan-Islamism as a feature of the Young Turkey movement, which is more a Pan-Islamic revival than a simple change of government from despotism to a so-called constitutionalism. I have the honour to enclose a translation of a pamphlet on the same lines which is sold at a penny, and of which, I learn, many tens of thousands of copies have been distributed gratis in Turkey during the month of Ramazan just expired. The name of the author, "Sheikh Mihrideen Uroussi," is the *nom-de-plume* of a certain Ahmed Hilmi Bey, a Bulgarian Moslem from Philippopoli, who has spent years in Tripoli of Barbary, and has worked as a Pan-Islamic agent among the Senussis and other Moslems of the Tripoli hinterland, among whom he has carried on a fierce anti-French propaganda, with the object of sapping the loyalty to the French of the Moslems composing the French detachments in those regions, so that, when the appointed time arrives, they may rise against and murder the French officers, and thus regain those districts for Islam. Ahmed Hilmi is, I am informed, a man of remarkable physical and mental energy, with a persuasive manner, and the gift of electrifying his audiences.

The pamphlet is in sermon form, and most of it, from a Moslem religious point of view, is as unexceptionable as were the preachings of Peter the Hermit to the Christians of those days. As in the Mahommedan mind Church and State are inextricably intertwined, it is a fervid appeal to Turkish Moslems to adopt the science and industrial methods of the West, while retaining the "blessed customs" of Islam, to "help the Moslem army to get rifles," and to "assist the Moslem army and fleet," with a view to delivering from the servitude of the Christian foe the 350,000,000 Mahommedans in Bokhara, Kashgar, India, Persia, China, Java, Egypt, the Soudan, Algiers, Tunis, Morocco, Kazan, the Crimea, and the Caucasus, "where the mosques are falling into ruin." This idea completely ignors the vaunted principle of the Young Turkey party that all the creeds and races of Turkey were to be Ottoman, on the basis of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

The writer proclaims that "Islam is one nation," and dubs as sowers of discord and intriguers those who would maintain that *e.g.* Georgians and Russians and Algerians are French. Such teachings, as will be noticed, affect the Powers of the Triple Entente who happen to be unfortunate enough to possess Islamic lands, while the Triple Alliance has not yet reduced any considerable bodies of Moslems to slavery.

An article published in the "Tasvir-i-efkiar" on the 6th instant and written by Ebb-uz-Zia, deputy for Konieh, adopts a very similar attitude in regard to Europe and Young Egypt. I have the honour to enclose herewith translation of a portion of this article which deals with England and Europe's selfish policy towards the Moslem world.

The rather curious phenomenon of a Young Turkish minority, who have captured the Power and are free-thinkers, being obliged to bid for the support of the deeply religious masses by posing as being more Catholic than the Pope is in a way but logical, and must be expected as long as the present anomalous form of a constitution propped up by martial law obtains in Turkey. Pan-Islamism under the old régime was defensive as compared with neo-Pan-Islamism of the new dispensation, which is positive and aggressive. In this connection, I may mention that I have recently heard of the formation of a secret society called "Hilal-i-Osmanieh," or the "Ottoman Cresentade," at the head of which is a thirty-third degree Mason of the "Grand Orient Ottoman." I hope later on to be able to report more fully on this organisation, the object of which is to extend the fraternal tie to the Moslems who are now under the infidel yoke. A certain Seyyid-el-Asali, a native of Tripoli, in Syria, who has travelled in Central Asia, Kashgar, and other parts of Chinese Turkestan, arrived here some time ago with some Turkestan Mahommedans to request the Ottoman Government to dispatch instructors to those regions. He has been received by the Sultan, and granted a religious firman from the Caliph, together with a sacred hair from the Prophet's beard, and is returning shortly viâ Merv, Bokhara, &c., to the Moslems of China as a missionary delegated by the Caliphate.

It would seem to a layman more practical for the Young Turks to make a serious attempt to bring about equilibrium in their budget than to indulge in these Pan-Islamic ventures.

I am sending copies of this despatch to Cairo and India.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 23.

Pamphlet by "Sheikh Mihrideen Uroussi."

THE following is a translation of a pamphlet by Sheikh Mihrideen Uroussi. It is described as an exhortation concerning the reasons for the decline of the Moslem world and the steps to be taken for its rise and progress:—

"Hear, O Moslems!

"O Moslems, O brothers in the Faith!

"Listen to me! The words I shall speak to you are the words of truth. Do you not believe in God and in his book? Now I shall speak to you out of the book of God. Just look at the world, and you will see that of 350,000,000 Moslems, 300,000,000 are slaves under the hands of strangers.

"It is a thousand pities that the servants [of God] who bear a banner inscribed with the words of witness should be destroyed; it is a thousand pities that those who believe in the unity of God, who recognise that God is one and his Prophet is true, should have remained under the feet of those who rush to cast down the truth; it is a thousand pities that the servants of God should have become slaves to nations other than the people of the beloved Prophet.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"Look at the Moslem world for a moment with my eyes; cast a glance at the world that you may be warned. What shall we see? Men groaning with hunger, men dressed in coarse rags; mosques in ruins, tumble-down imarets* where the cauldron boils no longer, schools with neither teachers nor scholars; villages and hamlets like ruins inhabited only by the screech-owl.

"Wherever we look—at Bokhara, Kashgar, India, Persia, China, Java, Egypt,

* Imaret: an institution attached to mosques for the distribution of food to needy scholars and to the poor.

the Soudan, Algiers, Tunis, Morocco, Kazán, the Crimea, the Caucasus—in fact everywhere except in the Ottoman Empire, the country of the Khalif who sits on the prayer-carpet of the Prophet, we see the head of the Moslem crushed to the earth, crushed beneath the enemy's yoke. Those enemies have taken their countries from them and made them strangers in their own lands.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"Why is it that these places, which once were as fruitful as Paradise, have fallen into ruin? Why is it that the Moslems, who once ruled the world, have become slaves?

"Is it that once we were many, and have become few? No! Is it that our country was once rich, and possesses riches no longer? No! Is it that we used to be brave and courageous and have now become cowardly? No! What has happened then? Why have we become slaves?

"O brothers in the Faith!

"Now I will speak to you a word more bitter than poison, bitterer than hell-fruit; I will speak to you a word of great truth. I will tell you the reason why we are despicable, wretched, poor, enslaved. It is because we have not hearkened to nor understood the commands of our God and of our Prophet; because we have been shameless and ignorant; because we have tyrannised over ourselves, over our brothers, over all the servants of God.

"In the sacred Koran God says: 'This world is the inheritance of the pious servants of God.' So long as we kept the commands of God and his Prophet and remained pious servants we were the rulers of the world. You think that 'pious servants' means those who merely bear the name of Moslem, or who keep just one of God's commands and reject the others. No! The Koran does not lie; God does not lie. Whose inheritance is the world to-day? In whose hands is it? If your supposition had been correct the world would have been in our possession to-day. That means that we are not pious servants; we have been so disobedient and shameless that God has given the world to the enemies of the faith, because they are better than ourselves and nearer to piety.

"Piety does not mean having a formal belief without hearkening to the commands of God. Piety means perfect belief; justice, *i.e.*, right conduct; fraternity, *i.e.*, brotherhood; sincerity, *i.e.*, freedom from lying; knowledge, *i.e.*, escape from ignorance.

"So the enemies of the faith have got hold of the world because their knowledge and their character are higher than ours, and because they love and help one another more than we do.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"Let us be ashamed before our God and blush before our Prophet, in that while believers and upholders of the unity we remained far from piety. Those who are not honoured with Islam have approached nearer to piety than we have. These words of mine are bitter, but they are true. Listen! They are not my words; they are the words of God.

"O Moslems!

"Let us be just. Let us call ourselves to account. Let us think before our consciences, and understand our faults. We all say that we are under the standard of Mohammed-al-Mustapha, leader of the two worlds; we all say we admit the unity of God and accept the Sheriat. If that is so, why do we do the direct contrary of whatever God says?

"O brothers in the Faith!

"Now weep blood over the verse which I shall read to you. Let us confess our faults and weep; for God—this God who 'loves those who turn from evil'—makes known to us by the Koran and by the traditions of the Prophet how the servants he loves ought to act. This verse will draw blood from the hearts of us all.

"'They who keep the compact they have made with God, and depart not from the word he has given'; 'They who act according to the command of God'; 'They who fear God, and fear the word that in the next world, when the accounts are made up, the evil will overbalance the good'; 'They who have been patient to win the approval of God,' *i.e.*, those who followed God's commands and did not pursue their own evil desires or fall into evil ways; 'They who have performed the prayers,' *i.e.*, those who

worshipped, carrying out every precept of God's command; 'They who had pity on their hungry and needy brethren, on their fellow-servants of God, and gave them of the blessings which God had given them'; 'They who avoided evil and loved good'; 'For them are all the blessings of the world to come.'

"And again: 'Those who broke the compact they made with God, after giving their word, who broke the commandments of God and rose in revolt upon the earth, for such are the curse of God and the tortures of the world to come.'

"Every believer has undertaken to keep the commands of God and of his Prophet. Since he says 'I am a Moslem,' he has made a compact with God. Now what are these commands? What is this compact? Do we keep the compact?

"Alas! Many of us do not keep the compact, Moslems! We do not keep the compact we have made with God. We listen to ourselves, and to the devils of men and jinn; but we hearken not to the commands of God. We have been liars; we have forgotten our compact. That is why so many disasters have come upon us; that is why the chain of slavery has been passed round our necks, and why our mosques and imarets are in ruins and our schools have become stables. Yes, we do not keep our compact; for God says: 'It was for learning that I created men and jinn'; whereas we think we came into the world to eat and drink and to envy one another, and we remain ignorant.

"O Moslems!

"Ignorance ill beseems the people of Mahommed. Our great Prophet commanded learning in thousands of traditions, such as: 'Seek knowledge, though it be in China'; and 'Seek knowledge from the cradle to the grave,' *i.e.*, from birth to death. And yet we have remained ignorant. We know no trade; we have no knowledge of science; which means that we have not kept the compact made expressly for Moslems. God tells us: 'There is nothing for man but what he earns by working.' Yet we Moslems pass our lives in idleness. Our Prophet wasted not even one day of his holy life; all the holy men were engaged in commerce or agriculture or in a trade; and the great imams and ulema of our faith laboured, and lived by the work of their hands.

"Our great Prophet said that poverty might drive out religion; yet we think it a virtue to be beggars and to leave our children in hunger and nakedness. This means that we have again failed to keep our compact, for we have not hearkened to God and his Prophet.

"God has forbidden to those who accept Islam all sins such as lying, drunkenness, sedition-mongering, gambling, usury, hate, enmity, and slander; and it is written in the Koran: 'God's curse be upon liars!' We get drunk without shame before God and his servants; we lie; we gamble; we plunder our co-religionists in the name of interest. Our hearts are filled with enmity towards each other; our whole work is to make one another suffer.

"Thus we do not keep our compact.

"O brothers in the faith!

"God commands us to help and love one another, *i.e.*, to love one another like brothers; and he says: 'All Moslems are brothers.' But we make attempts on the possessions and lives of our fellow-believers; we envy them. Among us there are those who carry off the wife of a co-religionist, who sacrifice to their pleasure a girl who is under the protection of God, who make attempts on the life, and plunder the wealth of their fellow-believers.

"What sort of brotherhood is this? We do not know what brotherhood means; and among us Moslems are very many who hearken not to the commands of God.

"O brothers in the faith!

"Our God commands us to help the poor, to love and console our fellow-believers. Do we carry out this order? Do we give alms in full? Do we stretch out a hand to those brethren whom we might save from hunger and misery? Do we strive by advice, by prayer, and by joining hands with them to save the evil from their evil ways?

"No! So again we have failed to keep our compact. It is a pity that we are all ignorant to-day. Many of us have strayed into evil ideas not based upon Islam. Science and knowledge have passed to other nations, but we have remained ignorant. Others make railways, astounding bridges, tunnels, harbours, ships, guns, and rifles; but we have none of these things. We do not work; we act as though ignorance and poverty were necessary conditions of Islam. We respect only a few of God's

commands, such as those relating to prayer and fasting; we act as though the others did not exist.

"O brothers in the faith!

"Islam is one nation. All Moslems being brothers, they all make up one nation, which is called the 'Moslem nation,' or the 'nation of Islam.' Every Moslem is of this nation, to whatever race he belong—whether he be Arab, Turk, Persian, Afghan, negro, Indian, Javanese, Albanian, Kurd, Circassian, Georgian, Lezki, or Chichen. Those who consider them as separate and different from each other are sowers of discord.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"The head and leader of all Moslems, the representative and Khalif of our Prophet, is the Ottoman Sultan. It is the duty of us all to obey all the commands of the Khalif, for they are lawful and true; and to disobey the sacred fetva of the Khalifate is a great error.

"The method of government of all governments subject to the faith of Islam is that of lawful consultation and constitution. In Islam there is not despotism, i.e., rule according to the arbitrary wishes of one man. If any Moslem accepts any principle other than that of consultation, he is guilty of disobedience towards the tradition of our Prophet and the command of God, and of giving assistance to tyranny.

"Everything was made known by God to our Prophet through an angel; the Prophet in turn made known everything to his companions, and always acted according to the opinion of them all. After our Prophet, the great Khalifs also were subject to the principle of consultation. It was the Yezidis who began the system of despotism.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"The hundreds of Moslem countries which formerly existed in the world have fallen one by one into the hands of other powers. Only four Moslem Governments in the whole world have remained independent: the Ottoman, which contains the seat of the Khalifate; the Persian; the Afghan; and the Moroccan. When the Abbassid Khalifs grew weak and fell into a state in which they could not be of any service to the Moslem faith, God had pity on this religion and on Islam, and made the Ottoman Turks soldiers and defenders of the Faith. They took over the Prophet's trust from the last of the Abbassids; they carried the frontiers of Islam to the very centre of Europe; they became brothers of bold races like the Albanians and with the Arabs, the Albanians, and the Kurds, they have shed their blood for seven hundred years, and protected Islam.

"As long as the Ottomans obeyed the command of God, Islam grew; it never diminished. As long as the Ottoman's remained just, good and pious, they were strong. As long as they were strong, Moslem countries were safe from the enemy's wickedness. But during the last two centuries many of them have left the straight path. The Moslems have lost the Danube, the Crimea, Caucasia, Algiers, Tunis, Egypt, Cyprus, and many another country, and Bokhara, Khiva and Kashgar are lost to them. But at last God had pity on them again. The Ottomans opened their eyes and saw their faults; they removed from his throne their Khalif and Sultan, who had acted contrary to God's command and the tradition of the Prophet; they did away with the accursed rule called despotism, and in its place established the principle of consultation and constitution, which is the command of Islam and the tradition of the Prophet. Together with the Ottomans, all other Moslems opened their eyes; they all understood that the path in which they had been treading was a blind alley. Now we have all seen that if we are not brothers, if we do not unite, we shall be crushed; they will make slaves of us, and leave us hungry and naked; and through the crowd of men that have overspread our land their priests will try to turn us from our faith.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"The enemies of Islam have seen that our eyes are opened and that we have begun to love one another, and they are afraid, for they know that if we Moslems give up our evil ways and unite we shall become masters of our honour. That is why they do not wish us to open our eyes and unite. In order to leave us poor and ignorant as of old, and to make us envious of each other, they have bought with money such traitors to their religion and their nation as there are amongst us. These accursed ones, who fear not God, try in three ways to leave us Moslems in slavery. Just see what those three ways are:—

"First: they are opposed to the principle of consultation and constitution, and say that the constitution is a thing which is taken from Europe and from the Christians, and has never been seen in Islamism. God send his curse upon those who utter this calumny! It was by Islam that 'consultation' was proclaimed for the first time in the world; the divine verse 'and counsellors . . . .' commands us to accept consultation. In all the affairs of the nation the Prophet used to collect his companions and take counsel with them; and his four successors did nothing without taking the opinion of the holy men and of the ulema of their time. Now there is an assembly of consultation, and everything is discussed with them. It is true that there are five or ten Christians and Jews among the members; their vote, however, is never taken on religious matters, but only in temporal affairs. And those who say that it is not right to take their opinion on temporal matters either are telling lies and speaking against Islamism.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"Are those who say those words the greater, or is the Prophet? Of course our Prophet is the greater. Our Prophet said: 'Wisdom is a possession which the believer has lost. Wherever he finds it he seizes it.' This means that we can take anybody's opinion in the affairs of the world provided that it is wise, that it is useful, and that it is not contrary to our religion.

"Secondly: they try to deceive you with feigned fanaticism and false ideas. They strive to prevent you from working and from making progress. Take care! Do not listen to these devils. Beware of these lazy fellows who praise beggary and poverty! Give them no money: leave them hungry and let us see what they will say and do.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"In order to guard our country, and to be able to struggle properly against the enemies of our faith and fatherland, we need millions of poundsworth of battleships, guns, rifles, and ammunition. If Moslems remain poor, how shall they buy these things? If they remain ignorant, how shall they make these things? Is not all poverty a disaster? That is why we have lost so many lands. And is not all ignorance a calamity? That is why we have lost so many wars.

"The seat of the khalifate is compelled to-day to maintain a million soldiers. If the nation is poor, how shall these soldiers be fed?

"Thirdly: they try to make a cleavage between the Moslem races—between the Turks and the Albanians and Arabs. Now, the greatest enemies of Islam are these sowers of discord. These accursed ones know that if the Arabs and the Albanians be separated from the Turks they will crush the Turks and leave Islam very, very weak; and that is why they strive with such devilries to separate these brothers.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"He who writes these words to you is above all a Moslem, one who holds truth above all things. Now I tell you that wherever the Turks became weak, the Moslem Khalifate was not loved; and where the representative of the Prophet was not loved, that part fell beneath the enemy's feet. Algiers, Tunis, and Egypt went in that way. If the Turks there had not become so weak, these places would have not been so easily lost.

"Afghanistan, one of the places where the Khalifate is loved, has saved itself. There is a great example in this: there are 50,000,000 of Arabs in the world to-day, and of these only 15,000,000 live independent in the Ottoman Empire and bear the Ottoman name, while more than 20,000,000 have fallen into French or English hands. Now our enemies see that if the Moslem nation ceases from separatist quarrels and unites, it will become very strong and protect its lands; that is why certain traitors to Islam among the Arabs bring about demands for separation and propose nationalist separatism.

"To propose separation to-day and not to desire and love unity is to desire the destruction of Islam.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"The blessed and revered Mehmed Reshad V sits now in the seat of the Khalifate, a seat given him by God and our Prophet; and his acceptability cannot be damaged by the untruthful words of those who are induced to speak by the money or instigations of our enemies.

"Then, too, there are base men who want to stir up the Albanians with talk of

racialism. The cause of their enmity to the Turks is that they say, 'Why have the Turks made the Albanians their brothers?' Yes; they are the foes of Islamism. They fill their bellies with the money received from Catholic priests, and they hope that, if the Turks and the Albanians are separated, they will be able to turn the Turks, *i.e.*, Islam, out of Europe, and then the Albanians will gradually become Christians.

"The Turks are the outposts of the Moslem army. The enemy know that the day they destroy the Turks they destroy Islam, and, therefore, they try to sow dissension among Ottoman Moslems.

"Fourthly: they try to split up the Moslems by sectarian differences; they want to bring about quarrels between Sunnis and Shi'ahs.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"The God we adore is one, and our Prophet is one. No Moslem, whether Sunni or Shi'ah, adores any other god or recognises any other prophet. So let us not listen to the enemy; let us not tie the rope round our necks with our own hands. It is a shameful thing; it is a sin.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"Now let us realise our faults and defects. Night and day, at the five prayer-times and especially before the mosque at Mecca and the Prophet's tomb, let us cry and pray, saying: 'There is one God; there is one nation! Union! Union! For the sake of the unity of God, grant us unity!'

"Let us cast out from among us the sowers of discord; let us not give ear to their words. They pretend to desire the strengthening of Islam and of the Khalifate! If the Ottoman Empire is strong, the Khalifate will also grow in strength.

"Then let us pray night and day for the strengthening of the Khalifate and the exaltation of Islam. Let there be no other wish or aim in the heart of anyone of us.

"Unity and fraternity! Union and brotherhood! These are the two forces that will save us. Let us unite and work. Let us spare a mouthful for others. Let us make schools, and leave not one child ignorant among us. Let us love our nation and our honour. Let us accept European civilisation, *i.e.*, science and industry, and even carry them still further. But let us not abandon the blessed customs of our religion and our nation, *i.e.*, Let us not adopt the material civilisation of the Europeans.

"Moslems ought to pay more attention to agriculture and commerce, and we ought to run our agriculture not on the old principles but according to the progress of the age. We must strive to make our land fertile; we must increase our stock of animals. Every one of us ought to try to keep a horse or a mare, as we are a military nation, and it would be of great advantage to us. Besides, in the matter of rearing horses there are the Prophet's encouragements and inducements; and their Koranic verses and sayings of the Prophet on the subject too.

"A Moslem ought not to think only of those Moslems belonging to his own race. The brotherhood of Islam and its spiritual unity will appear gloriously in the full meaning of the terms when we learn not to forget our co-religionists in the Soudan, in the Sahara, Senegal, Morocco, Algiers, Tunis, Egypt, Afghanistan, Java, China, India, Persia, Turkestan, Kazan. When we learn to regard it as a moral and religious obligation to grieve at their sorrows and to rejoice at their happiness.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"Whoever loves his religion, his nation, and his race, and who desires to see Islam exalted, ought to serve the cause of union and brotherhood. Whoever wishes the Moslems to be rescued from slavery, ought to spare something from his store and spend it on schools. Whoever wishes to go into God's presence with unstained forehead, ought to assist schools and colleges to save his Moslem brethren from ignorance.

"O, brothers in the Faith!

"Whoever wishes to win the favour of God and the intercession of the Prophet, should help to strengthen the Khalifate with hand, with voice, and with purse.

"By God, by God, by God! The most acceptable form of worship to-day is to help the Moslem army to get rifles, even if only to the extent of 10 paras, or to assist the army and the fleet.

"To give money for schools and to save a fellow-believer from ignorance is better than setting free a thousand slaves.

"O brothers in the Faith!

"I write you these words out of the promptings of my heart. It is God who makes me speak them. My brethren, I beg you to read this prayer with me. The doors of mercy are open; the future is ours. Let us join our hearts, and pray to our God, saying:—

"'O God! one and great and mighty, who didst promise to Islam thy divine help! Help Islam and give it the victory.

"'O our God! For the sake of thy all-knowing name, make the people of Islam lovers of knowledge and learning. For thy rich and generous name make the faithful rich and prosperous through the love of work and acquiring wealth.

"'O our God! for the sake of thy unity unite our aims and efforts; separate us not from unity in this world or in the world to come.

"'O our God! Make the Khalif of Islam to live long in health, and to stand in the way of truth. Help the Moslem army, send abundance upon the servants of Islam, and generously and mercifully reward the good intent of all Moslems.

"'Thy prayers and thy peace, with infinite grace and with the mercy befitting thee, be upon the Prophet and the house of the Prophet.'"

Enclosure 2 in No. 23.

Extract from the "Tasvir-i-Efkiar."

THE following is a translation of part of an article by Ebh-uz-Zia, deputy for Konieh, in the "Tasvir-i-Efkiar," entitled "The Young Egyptians and Europe."

"Europeans appear to be animated by the sole desire that Moslems in every part of the world should remain in misery. It seems that wherever new ideas appear, European public opinion does not hesitate to apply to the holders of those ideas the terms 'inexperienced, unreasonable, and fanatical.' To that attitude are due the difficulties placed in the way of the Young Egyptians in their struggle for independence and the false statements current about them.

"To-day the Young Egyptians, who have adopted as the basis of their policy the theory of Egypt for the Egyptians, cannot find a place to meet in freedom-loving Europe. They were turned out of France—the country which made the eighteenth century glorious by its proclamation of the rights of man. Why? Perhaps they cannot reconcile Islam with the policy of the West to-day. Because those gentlemen who imagine that the yellow race is inferior to the white think it would shame them to see the superiority of Islam to Christian civilisation. In any case they do not want the political knowledge of Moslems to develop; for their interests depend on Moslem ignorance, and they think their prestige would be lowered by the legal equality which would result if Moslems acquired knowledge and understanding. They want us to exist to serve them, and it does not please them to see the possibility of our becoming our own friends and helpers.

"It is worth noting that one race thinks itself competent to judge whether another is worthy or not of that gift of nature—the blessing of freedom, and tries to show that it is lawful to take another race under its protection.

"Let us suppose that that race (the Egyptian) is in the lowest depth of ignorance and that the English administration by its perfect justice proves its superiority over all other Governments of the world. Very well. But let the English act justly first of all in Great Britain; let them satisfy the Irish; but let them let alone the Egyptians, who have no need of their justice.

"But no! If the poor creatures got their freedom, they will demand their independence too; and that will affect English interests.

"We congratulate the Young Egyptians very sincerely on their patriotic views. We would also warn them very sincerely that the chief duty of a body of men striving in the name of a nation and a country to confine their efforts to spreading such influence and education as will assure the progress and prosperity of the people. If once the people's eye and forsight be lighted with the light of education every success is assured."

[37537] No. 24.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 17.)

(No. 718.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October 10, 1910.*

I SAW Rifaat Pasha again yesterday with regard to the arbitrary demolitions of British property that have been proceeding at Bagdad, and I presented to his Excellency a *note verbale*, copy of which is enclosed herewith, requesting that instructions might be sent to the Bagdad authorities to indemnify the sufferers for the loss sustained by them.

I spoke generally in the sense of your telegram No. 304 of the 6th instant. Rifaat Pasha said that the sufferers should bring actions against the municipality. I said that it was impossible that, under present circumstance, justice would be obtained in an action brought by a foreigner against the municipality, which to all intents and purposes was identical with the vilayet authorities. Moreover, as the buildings had been demolished on the ground that they were unsafe, it would be quite impossible for a court of law to establish at the present time whether or not the plea of insecurity were proved.

I told Rifaat Pasha that the estimated damage up to the present time amounted to over 4,000*l.*, but I had not mentioned any sum in my note as the demolitions were continuing and as the projected street extended over 3 kilom., the total amount promised to be considerable.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 24.

Note verbale communicated to Rifaat Pasha.

IN its *pro-memorid*, in Turkish, of the 15th, and in its *note verbale* No. 81 of the 16th August, His Majesty's Embassy had the honour of addressing the Sublime Porte on the subject of the arbitrary demolition by the municipal authorities at Bagdad of property belonging to British subjects under the pretext that they were in a dangerous condition. In one case it was a question of six shops which had been built only four years ago and which were in a perfectly sound condition. The owners of this property as also of other properties of British subjects which have been similarly demolished at Bagdad, Kazimia, and Kerbela—protested against the pretext being given that the houses were in dangerous condition, but these protests, contrary to the regulations governing such matters, were rejected, and their properties arbitrarily demolished by force, while the authorities refused also to apply the expropriation law.

His Majesty's Embassy is convinced that the Imperial Ottoman Government cannot approve these illegal proceedings of its local authorities at Bagdad, and in accordance with instructions received from His Britannic Majesty's Government, has the honour to request that orders may be sent to the Bagdad vilayet to indemnify the British subjects for the losses incurred by them owing to the arbitrary destruction of their property under certain pretexts which really amount to acts of veiled spoliation.

Constantinople, October 8, 1910.

[37539] No. 25.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 17.)

(No. 720.)

Sir, *Pera, October 10, 1910.*

I HAVE received your despatch No. 289 of the 27th ultimo, forwarding certain confidential correspondence on the subject of the difficulties experienced by the Sheikh of Koweit in connection with the transfer of his property at Fahaghia. In the course of this correspondence His Majesty's agent at Koweit brings forward the suggestion that "the recognition by the Turkish authorities of Koweit as a distinct nationality would go far towards a permanent settlement of the present as well as the larger question of the whole status of Koweit."

This suggestion appears to me to be one that would never be accepted by the present Ottoman Government, with its chauvinistic tendencies. Last year, when the more moderate-minded Hilmi Pasha was Grand Vizier, he found it impossible even to accept the suggestion made by this embassy that Mubarak-es-Sabah or his son should be registered on the "tapu" as "inhabitants of Koweit." A proposal to admit the existence of Koweit as a separate nationality would consequently be still more obnoxious to the Sublime Porte.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

[37544] No. 26.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 17.)

(No. 725.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October 12, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from Mr. Lorimer, consul-general at Bagdad, reporting on the encroachments of the municipal authorities on the property of British subjects in that town.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 768/38. Confidential.)

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, September 3, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to enclose, for your information, copies of papers relating to the case of Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers, British Indian manufacturers of ice at Bagdad. I have telegraphed more than once to your Excellency about this case; but the present despatch and its enclosures explain the position more fully than it was possible to do by telegram. The papers submitted are in one or two instances extracts only, matters relating to other cases having been intentionally omitted from them.

An ice machine owned by the Bagdad municipality has existed here for a number of years; but its output, I understand, is not very considerable. It is, at any rate, quite incommensurate with the requirements of Bagdad, which three existing ice machines do not fully meet. The only local manufacturers of ice besides the municipality are Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers, who own two factories, who are the commercial pioneers of the industry, in developing which they have shown much enterprise, and who have sunk a considerable capital in it. Messrs. Abdul Ali's first and smaller machine, upon this side of the river, is now completing its third season; the larger, on the further side, was erected last spring and commenced working shortly after the arrival of Nazim Pasha, the present vali, at Bagdad. There was some difficulty about the establishment of the earlier machine, in which connection I would refer your Excellency to my predecessor's marginally noted despatches;† but it was overcome, and the machine has since then been allowed to work without objection. I have no reason to think that the account of the erection of the second machine given by Messrs. Abdul Ali in one of the enclosures to this despatch is in any way incorrect. I abstained from intervention in that matter. Messrs. Abdul Ali are also the owners of an ice machine at Karbala, where there is only one other, owned by a Russian subject.

Soon after the middle of July last, the vali, through the medium of the Bagdad municipality, issued an order that ice was not to be sold at a rate exceeding 10 paras a kilogramme. This was an arbitrary and a very low rate, as shown by the fact that, according to Messrs. Abdul Ali's books, they have sometimes been able, in the summer season, to obtain as much as 50 or 60 paras a kilogramme for their ice. These prices were voluntarily paid by their customers, and are an index of the market value of the commodity. Before the establishment of Messrs. Abdul Ali's first factory, the municipality used to sell their ice at 40 paras per kilogramme wholesale, and it was

* Not before, as was erroneously reported in my telegram of August 26; but this point is not material.

† No. 673/89 of July 31, 1907, and No. 480/51 of June 4, 1906.

sometimes retailed at double that figure. The competition of Messrs. Abdul Ali thus greatly reduced the price to consumers and benefited the whole population of Bagdad.

Nazim Pasha had before this taken upon himself to regulate authoritatively the price of grain and flour at Bagdad, as I reported at the time (see Summary for June 1910, V, 10). On enquiring into the matter, I found that in the case of ice the vali relied upon article 3 of the Law of Provincial Municipalities,* which contains a list of matters with which such municipalities are empowered to deal. It will be observed that, while this article confers the power of regulating the price of bread, which is a necessity of life, it says nothing of ice, which is a luxury, and ought to be paid for as such by those who can afford it. So far as I can ascertain, the vali's idea in limiting the price of ice was to gain a little cheap popularity at the expense of the manufacturers; and the class whom he had chiefly in his mind seems to have been that of the young Turkish officers, not belonging to Bagdad, who have lately made their appearance here in large numbers, and who are not too well paid.

I had various conversations with the vali's political secretary on the subject of the regulation of the price of ice, in which I maintained that action of the kind proposed was not warranted by the law, and eventually, though direct attempts to intimidate Messrs. Abdul Ali into compliance with the order did not cease, this side of the question was dropped by the secretary in his discussions with me. At one of our meetings the secretary hinted that, if the vali's order were not obeyed, the vilayat would proceed to "play it low upon us" ("aller faire des misères") by closing the Indian factories on the technical ground that they had been erected without municipal authorisation. This remark was no doubt intended as a threat, but it was made in confidence, and it cannot therefore be quoted in any discussion at Constantinople.

Ultimately, as the enclosures to this despatch show, the vali took the line foreshadowed by the secretary, and called on me to co-operate in closing the factories. On my enquiring once more under what legal warrant this was proposed to be done, I was referred to the law of the 15th May, 1864, which lays down the conditions under which steam engines may be established. As the enclosed correspondence shows, I have protested in vain against this perverse misapplication of a very clear law. The Turkish text, as pointed out in my latest letter to the vali, is even more distinctly in favour of my contention than Young's French translation of the law,† upon which the vilayat have apparently founded their arguments. So far as I can discover, there is no means under Turkish law of imposing conditions upon the use of machinery actuated by oil engines without recourse to new legislation, and such legislation would call for very careful discussion with foreign Powers before its introduction.

The position now is that the two Indian factories are threatened with forcible closure under an irrelevant law, and I have the honour to request your Excellency's assistance in this matter, which vitally affects the security of all British owners of machinery here, such as Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co., Messrs. Blockey, Cree, and Co., and Messrs. Blaney and Solomon. I am told by the vali's political secretary that Nazim Pasha, who is swayed largely by personal likes and dislikes, and who regards the slightest opposition to his measures (even if illegal) as high treason, has placed Messrs. Abdul Ali in his bad books, and is determined to ruin them if possible. This is a point which, of course, in view of the political secretary's delicate position, and the freedom of his conversations with me, it is impossible to bring forward, even unofficially; but it deserves to be borne in mind by those who are responsible for the protection of Messrs. Abdul Ali's commercial interests. It is for your Excellency's orders what steps should be taken in regard to the loss of G.S.P. 24,693¼ or upwards which has already been sustained by Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers, through interference with their trade from the 22nd July to the 14th August inclusive, during which time they were obliged to sell ice at 10 paras per kilogramme instead of 20 to 60 paras. Will the Porte agree to award them compensation by an executive order, or will it be necessary for the firm to bring a suit against the Bagdad municipality?

Your Excellency will observe that the line which I have finally adopted is that, as no agreement on the legal question can be reached here, the matter ought to be referred for an authoritative decision by the Sublime Porte, in consultation with your Excellency, at Constantinople; and that, in the meantime, the *status quo* should be respected. This seems to me a reasonable suggestion, inasmuch as there is no urgency whatever in the matter; and I have endeavoured to make it acceptable to the vali by offering to confer with any officer whom his Excellency may appoint, on the subject of defects that may exist in the factories. I understand, however, that it is not alleged that they

* See Young's "Corps de Droit ottoman," I, 69–84. † Ibid., II, 510–514.

constitute in any respect a danger to the public; and I do not anticipate that it can be shown that they are in any way a nuisance. The intention of the vali, no doubt, is to refuse authorisation for a new factory under any conditions; and probably he would thereafter proceed to create a monopoly in favour of the municipality, whose finances he is administering with a free hand, without consulting the Municipal Committee (see Summary for July 1910, III, 2).

In conclusion, I would remark that Abdul Ali and his brothers are most meritorious British Indian subjects. They were originally working tin-smiths, but they have raised themselves by thrift and industry to a respectable and even prominent position among the foreign merchants at Bagdad. Their general shop is one of the best here. They state the amount of the capital sunk in their two factories at Bagdad to be about £ T. 3,095; and the loss to them through the closure of these factories at the present season would probably be £ T. 20 or more a-day. The loss *per diem* which they would sustain if they were compelled to part with their ice at Bagdad at 10 paras a kilogramme would apparently be £ T. 10 or upwards. Their factory at Karbala, on which they have expended, they say, £. T. 1,240, is liable to be interfered with, no doubt, in the same manner as their business at Bagdad has been.

As Abdul Ali and his brothers are Bohrahs, and, therefore, members of an important commercial caste at Bombay, I am sending a copy of this despatch and its enclosures to the Government of India for information. Abdul Ali is the accredited agent in this country of the "Faiz-i-Husaini," a great Bohrah association for the facilitation of pilgrimages. Even at the present season scores of pilgrims are passing monthly through his hands; and, as the weather grows cooler, the number will rise to hundreds. It is only to be expected that on their return to India these pilgrims will talk freely of the state of matters prevailing at Bagdad, and that their views will reflect those of Abdul Ali and his agents.

I trust that your Excellency may be pleased to approve of my action up to the present in this somewhat difficult case.

I have, &c.
J. G. LORIMER, I.C.S.,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

Enclosure 2 in No. 26.

Statement of Khair Muhammad, a British Subject in the Service of Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers, and in charge of the latter's Ice Shop in the Suk-el-Meydan.

AT about noon of the 20th July, 1910, a servant of the Baladieh named Sulman came to the ice shop and asked the price of the ice, and I told him that the price was 20 paras per kilogramme. He said: "I shall report you, and you will be fined 2 liras." He then left the shop and went to Yuzbashi Ali Riza Beg, who was at the time superintending the levelling of the roads in the neighbourhood. Yuzbashi Ali Riza Beg sent after me, and I went to him. He asked me: "Why do you sell ice at 20 paras per kilogramme? A notice has been issued by the vali that ice shall be sold at 10 paras per kilogramme." I told him that I had received no orders from the vali to sell ice at 10 paras. He replied: "As the vali's orders had not reached you, I order you to sell at 10 paras." This conversation took place in the bazaar. I returned to the shop, and the servant of the Baladieh came there and asked me for ice at 10 paras the kilogramme. I refused to give at that price, and said that I wanted a written order first. The servant went and informed Yuzbashi Ali Riza Beg, who came to the shop and ordered the man on the scales to give the servant 5 kilog. of ice at 10 paras per kilogramme, raising at the same time a whip, and threatening to strike the weigher. The latter being afraid of a thrashing at once weighed out 5 okes of ice and gave it to the servant. I asked him to give me a written order showing that I was forcibly ordered to sell ice at 10 paras per kilogramme. He agreed, and gave me a written paper in Turkish. I closed the shop and went to inform Abdul Ali, and handed over to him the paper that Yuzbashi Ali Riza Beg gave to me.

At the time I had twelve blocks of ice, weighing 600 kilog., in the shop. I returned to the shop, but I did not sell any more ice that day. On the following morning I went to the shop and sold what remained of it, about 180 to 200 kilog., at 10 paras per kilogramme. After this incident I did not sell any more ice in the shop. About three or four days later a zabtieh came to me to the shop and told me that Jawad Beg wanted me at the Sarai. I told him that I had no ice and it was no

use my going. The zabtieh said that someone had reported me to Jawad Beg to the effect that I had ice in the shop and was selling it at 20 paras the kilogramme. I then went with the zabtieh to Jawad Beg. The latter said to me: "Your Effendi has written to the vali that it does not pay you to sell ice at 10 paras the kilogramme; if it is so you must close the factory." I told him that I had not brought ice to the shop, nor had sold ice for the last few days. Why had he sent for me? He then said that whoever wanted to sell ice must sell it at 10 paras the kilogramme.

A couple of retailers who were standing by at the time addressed Jawad Beg, saying that if they were to sell ice at 10 paras the kilogramme they would lose. Jawad Beg told them that he would direct the municipality to sell them ice at 8 paras the kilogramme, and they could dispose of it at 10 paras. I then left the Sarai, and since that day, fearing interference, I have sold no ice.

KHAIR MUHAMMAD.

The foregoing statement was read over to Khair Muhammad before signing it, and he declared that it was correct.

J. CALCOTT GASKIN,
Commercial Assistant.

Baghdad, August 23, 1910.

Enclosure 3 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to M. Eram Bey.

Dear M. Eram Bey, *Baghdad, July* 22, 1910.

ABDUL ALI, the British Indian merchant, has come to me this morning to report that ice is being demanded from him by a military officer at 1 piastre per hukkah, whereas he usually sells it at 2 piastres.

I should like to discuss with you some time the question whether under Turkish law a trader can be compelled to sell his goods at a fixed price; I am not personally aware of any law which authorises it.

This at least seems to me clear, that he cannot be compelled to manufacture goods in order to sell them at a rate which he does not accept. I have therefore told Abdul Ali that if he does not consider the price of 1 piastre per hukkah satisfactory he is at liberty to cease the manufacture of ice for the present.

I have thought it better to inform you of this and to send Abdul Ali to you with one of my dragomans, in case he should decide on closing his ice factory until the reduced rate is withdrawn, and inconvenience should thereby be caused to the public during the next few days.

Yours very truly,
J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 4 in No. 26.

Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers to Consul-General Lorimer.

Sir, *Baghdad, July* 30, 1910.

WE beg to bring to your notice that we have so far obeyed the order of his Excellency the Vali, and are selling the ice at the rate of 10 paras per kilogramme, but we find ourselves unable to carry out any further the orders of his Excellency the Vali. This arbitrary rate of 10 paras per kilogramme of ice does not cover even our manufacturing expenses, not to speak of the profit on the investment.

We beg to bring to your notice that comparatively much higher rates for ice prevail in Europe from whence these mechanics, &c., come, and where the cost of working these machines is much cheaper owing to the facilities of transport, plentifulness of expert workers, and the climate which comparatively allows a very small percentage of wastage of the ice. We are informed that even in Constantinople the rate per kilogramme is double what we have been selling at before his Excellency the Vali's order, *i.e.*, 20 paras per kilogramme.

Prior to our bringing in these machines the municipality rate at Bagdad was 40 paras per kilogramme, as is the case at the present moment at Bussorah and Amarah. It is we that by increasing the number of ice machines had reduced the rate to 20 paras.

The municipality possessed only one machine which turned out a very insignificant amount of ice which was not sufficient even for a single quarter of Bagdad, and ice could not be had at any price after a certain fixed time. At the repeated requests of Colonel J. Ramsay and the leading men of Bagdad we established ice factories at Bagdad, and have been supplying ice not only to Bagdad public at a reduced rate, but also to Kazimain and Karbala people as well. These services for the last four years should have given us a claim to the particular consideration of the local authorities, but we are sorry to find that unjustifiable obstructions are put in our way, in order, we believe, to secure the monopoly for the municipality.

Turkish officials make no secret of their feelings towards foreign traders, and some of them have openly told us to our face that we had no right to benefit ourselves at the cost of Turkish people, as if we employed unfair means to do so.

We believe every person is free to earn his livelihood, by fair means of course, in Turkish dominions. We have always conformed to the laws and regulations of the country, and have always obeyed the rules regulating trade in Turkey.

We therefore cannot understand why unlawful difficulties are put in our honest business. We know that in other civilised countries there is no law regulating rates for articles of trade, and our enquiring from the advocates lead us to believe that there is no such law even in Turkey, and that this order of his Excellency the Vali is arbitrary and contrary to the law. To-day a rate is prescribed for ice, and to-morrow a rate will be fixed for other articles we deal in. It means that we should altogether close our business and depart. If from the beginning they have fixed a rate for the ice, we have not undergone such a heavy expense and loss.

We therefore beg to request that you will kindly represent the matter to his Excellency the Vali and submit our grievances to his Excellency the Ambassador at Constantinople telegraphically, as we are suffering a great loss. Moreover, we are losing the season, the earnings of which enables us alone to maintain the establishment of the factories for the whole year.

We beg, &c.
(Abdul Ali Brothers),
A. ALLI ADAMJI

Enclosure 5 in No. 26.

Purport of Telegram from Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

Baghdad, July 31, 1910.

MANUFACTURERS of ice have been ordered not to take a higher price than 10 paras per kilogramme for their ice. By this order a British Indian subject, who could formerly ask 20 paras per oke, has been hard hit, as he is the largest manufacturer of ice here. The new price will not, he says, allow him to sell at a profit, and he is of opinion that the order has been given so as to edge him out of the business, and allow the municipal ice factory to step in and have a monopoly.

Certain oil engines within municipal limits, which until the present have been working there, have been ordered to cease work by the vali's directions. Two flour mills owned by European British subjects come under the prohibition. It may be that this is designed to cause the owners to purchase new sites outside the town from the municipal authorities, or perhaps it is a blow aimed at their business.

Both these orders seriously, and possibly intentionally, interfere with British trade, and they do not appear to have any legal justification. Your Excellency might be so kind as to take what steps are required to protect these interests. The hot season, during which the demand for ice is great, is passing on fast, so that until some decision is arrived at things might be permitted to continue as heretofore.

Enclosure 6 in No. 26.

Purport of Telegram from Sir G. Louther to Consul-General Lorimer.

Constantinople, August 2, 1910.

REFERS to our wire of the 31st July, and states that the price of necessities like bread can be fixed by the municipality under article 3 of the municipal laws. To interpret the article as giving power to regulate the price of luxuries would appear somewhat arbitrary, though it is conceivable that this could be done.

There appears to be no legal justification for the stoppage of a mill by the vali. He is at liberty to expropriate if he desires to improve the town. His Excellency the Ambassador has spoken of both matters at the Porte, but considers that such matters might better be settled locally with the vali.

Enclosure 7 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to M. Eram Bey.

Dear M. Eram Bey, *Bagdad, August* 3, 1910.

WILL you please refer to my letters to you of the 26th and 28th July?

I have now studied the question of the power of Turkish municipalities to regulate prices; and I find that they are only entitled to fix the price of bread. The law on the subject is that of 1877, "Provincial Municipalities," article 3. I propose therefore to inform Abdul Ali Brothers that they are at liberty to sell their ice at whatever price they please, but I think his Excellency might prefer that the municipality should itself inform the firm in question that the restrictive order is withdrawn; and I shall therefore await your answer before communicating my opinion to Abdul Ali. I would ask you to reply at your early convenience, as a British trader is suffering considerable loss from an order which now appears to be illegal.

As to oil engines, there seems to be no law under which they can be prohibited from working within the municipal limits. I am told that the prohibition has been withdrawn, but I should be glad to know this from you, as the information I have received may be incorrect.

Believe me, yours very truly,

J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 8 in No. 26.

Note by Consul-General Lorimer.

ON the 5th July Eram Bey called.

2. On the 6th July Abdul Ali came, and I told him that in my opinion he was free to charge what he liked for his ice. I added that Eram Bey said, if he charged over rate fixed, his factory would be closed as being defective. I said I would contest closure on ground of his having manufactured for four years and sunk capital in business without objection.

J. G. L.

Bagdad, July 7, 1910.

Enclosure 9 in No. 26.

Statement by Abdul Ali.

ABDUL ALI states:—

I have now been selling my ice at 1 piastre a kilogramme under compulsion from the Turkish authorities* for about a month. I first received the order through Musa Chalabi, acting president of the municipality. Since then I have always sold the ice at the same

* I can ascertain the exact date.—J. G. L.

reduced price. On the first day, before I had informed my branches, Ali Riza Beg Yuzbashi went to my Midan branch and threatened my agent with a stick, and obliged him to sell the stock, some 300 or 400 okes, to a crowd of people at a reduced price. The loss was thus about 300 or 400 piastres. After this I began to sell at 1 piastre.

About five or six days later, the Sar-Mufattish and two Mamurs of the Baladieh came to my shop and entered my private room, and said that I was selling my ice in various places through my agents at 3 and 4 piastres an oke. I replied that I was selling at 1 piastre, but that Turkish subjects who bought it from me retailed it on their own account, possibly, at higher prices. They declined to believe this explanation, and ordered me to stop working my machine. I declined to attend to the order, and said they should deal with me through the consulate. An hour later, Musa Chalabi and the Sar-Mufattish came to me, and said that the vali had sent for me to order me to stop my machine. Musa admitted that, when he was going to the vali, he had stopped a man carrying ice from my shop, and asked at what price it had been sold, to which the man had replied, "1 piastre"; and he had told the vali this, and the vali had said nothing. This settled the thing for the time being. It was about fifteen days ago.

On Monday last (the 10th August) an Effendi (name not known) came to my small machine house, and said, "Why don't you sell the ice to the people who are waiting outside?" The door was closed: they forced it. He made my employé sell the ice there at 1 piastre; and about half of it disappeared without being paid for at all.

On Tuesday a man complained against my employé on the further bank that he had taken 65 piastres, and given him less than 50 kilog. of ice. Five or six police and municipal officials came to the factory there. There was some delay in opening the door, and they severely beat the coolie (a Turkish subject) who came to open it. The ice was weighed after this and found to be 60 kilog. Some of it may have melted. At any rate, it was sold in a lump and not by weight.

My little ice machine on this side has been working for nearly four years. After the beginning no difficulty was made.

My larger machine on the further side was established last April. I got permission in writing to erect the premises. It is not the custom here to get any special permission for a factory.

J. G. LORIMER.

Bagdad, August 11, 1910.

Enclosure 10 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Bagdad.

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, August* 11, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that the British firm of Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers have complained to me of interference with their trade on the part of the Bagdad municipality, which has been attempting during the past month to oblige them to sell their ice to the public at an arbitrary rate.

As Turkish provincial municipalities have no power to regulate the price of ice, I have informed Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers that they are at liberty to fix and alter the price of their ice as they please; and I have instructed them to refer to me in case of any further illegal interference with their operations.

I beg that your Excellency will give this matter your early attention, as Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers have suffered considerable loss by the unlawful action of the municipality, and the treatment which they have received is calculated to alarm and to discourage all the British merchants at Bagdad.

Pray accept, &c.

J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 11 in No. 26.

Statement by Abdul Ali.

(Memorandum.)

ABDUL ALI came to the consulate-general this morning and made the following report :—

Yesterday afternoon, at about a little before 4 o'clock, Abdul Rahman Pasha, president of the municipality, sent for him at his private house, and there were Jawad Beg, Abdul Kader Khedeiri, and others present. He (Abdul Ali) was accompanied by his brother, Tayibali.

Speaking for Jawad Beg, Abdul Rahman Pasha told him that, as they were not obeying the orders of the vali, and were not selling ice at 10 paras the kilogramme, and as he had not obtained permission to erect his factory, they would stop his factory working, and he must not think that it would be permitted to sell ice at Bagdad at a higher rate than 10 paras the kilogramme.

Abdul Ali asked them whether the permit referred to the small or large factory, and they replied that it referred to both. Abdul Ali told them that, as regards the small factory, the municipality opposed its erection at first, but after a prolonged correspondence between the British consulate-general and the vilayat, the consul-general told him that he may erect and work the factory, and when he worked his ice machine, the municipality interfered no longer with him ; but as regards the big factory, he reported to the municipality his desire to build it, and on numerous occasions officers, a doctor, an engineer, and a couple of councillors were sent to inspect the place and machinery, and finally the municipality issued to him a written permit, for which he was charged a fee, while other factories were not charged any fees at all. Jawad Beg replied, through Abdul Rahman, that he knew that Abdul Ali had no permits, and that the next day (the 17th August) he would close both factories. Abdul Ali said that he would not himself stop the factories, and that, if they wished to do anything, they had better correspond with the consulate-general regarding the question.

Before leaving, Jawad Beg directed Abdul Rahman Pasha to write to the vali about closing the factories.

J. C. G.

August 17, 1910.

Enclosure 12 in No. 26.

Note by Mr. Gaskin.

Resident,

I SUBMIT a letter from Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers, enclosing an account of their sales of ice at 10 paras the kilogramme from the 22nd July, 1910, to the 14th August, 1910.

The account shows that 98,771 kilog. of ice were sold for G.S.P. 24,693½. It is experienced that between the 14th July and the 13th August the most oppressive heat of the season prevails, and Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers declare that their books will prove that during that period in previous years they usually obtained from 30 to 60 paras the oke for their ice ; it cannot therefore be considered as romantic if they were to claim that they could have sold their ice at 20 paras the kilogramme during the period they were forced to dispose of their ice at 10 paras the kilogramme.

If Messrs. Abdul Ali are in the right, then they have a lawful claim against the local authorities for G.S.P. 24,693½, the difference in the price they would have obtained for their ice.

J. C. G.

August 25, 1910.

Enclosure 13 in No. 26.

Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers to Consul-General Lorimer.

Bagdad, August 19, 1910.

Sir,

WE most respectfully beg to state that, according to the order issued by his Excellency the Governor-General of Bagdad, we sold our ice at the rate of 10 paras instead of 20 paras, the statement of which is herewith sent for your kind perusal.

Further, we beg to state that if we sell at former rate of 20 paras we would have got double amount of the statement ; during this hot weather, if we increase our rate we dare say we will get much more amount. We leave this matter for your justice and disposal.

ABDUL ALI ADAMJEE.

Enclosure 14 in No. 26.

STATEMENT of Ice sold.

		Quantity Sold.	Per Kilog.	G.S.P.
		Kilog.	Paras.	
July	22, 1910	4,383	10	1,095 30
,,	24, ,, ...	4,159	10	1,039 35
	25, ,, ...	5,195	10	1,298 65
	26, ,, ...	4,042	10	1,010 25
	27, ,, ...	4,957	10	1,239 10
	28, ,, ...	5,678	10	1,419 20
,,	29, ,, ...	2,825	10	706 10
,,	30, ,, ...	6,372	10	1,593 00
,,	31, ,, ...	6,192	10	1,548 00
August	1, ,, ...	1,522	10	380 20
,,	2, ,, ...	5,926	10	1,481 20
,,	3, ,, ...	5,215	10	1,303 30
,,	4, ,, ...	3,979	10	994 30
,,	5, ,, ...	2,716	10	679 00
,,	6, ,, ...	4,675	10	1,168 30
	7, ,, ...	4,583	10	1,145 30
	8, ,, ...	3,219	10	804 30
	9, ,, ...	3,302	10	825 20
,,	10, ,, ...	4,302	10	1,075 20
,,	11, ,, ...	4,085	10	1,021 15
,,	12, ,, ...	3,563	10	890 30
,,	13, ,, ...	2,640	10	660 00
,,	14, ,, ...	5,241	10	1,310 10
	Total	98,771		24,693 10

Enclosure 15 in No. 26.

Purport of Telegram sent to Sir G. Louther.

August 26, 1910

WITH reference to the consul-general's telegram dated the 31st July, the vali, after having failed in his attempt to force the Indian manufacturer of ice to sell at a reduced rate, is now threatening to close his factories by force, on the plea that these factories were established without permission. This action is clearly vindictive, as these factories have been working, and without any objection having been registered against them, since before the arrival of Nazim Pasha in Bagdad. The Indian manufacturer is member of an influential trading community in the Bombay presidency, and it would be a pity if it came to be believed at Bombay that British Indian subjects did not receive satisfactory consular protection in this country. Mr. Lorimer requests his Excellency most urgently to take measures against the factories of the Indian ice manufacturer being wrongfully closed ; and to bring about a cessation, if this can be done, of the insecure general and commercial conditions now prevailing at Bagdad, which are intolerable.

The Austrian and German consuls have given the consul-general some information about their difficulties with the vali, and in their cases it would appear that the said vali is seriously at fault.

Enclosure 16 in No. 26.

Purport of Telegram from Sir G. Louther.

Constantinople, August 27, 1910.

REFERS to Mr. Lorimer's wire of the 12th October (?), and states that the Minister for Foreign Affairs is telegraphing to the vali for an explanation on the question of the threatened interference with the working of Abdul Ali's ice factory.

Enclosure 17 in No. 26.

The Vali of Bagdad to Consul-General Lorimer.

M. le Consul général, *Bagdad, le* 15 (28) *août*, 1910.

FAISANT suite à ma lettre en date du 17 (4) août, j'ai l'honneur de vous informer que votre ressortissant Abdul Ali n'ayant pas encore exhibé d'autorisation, je viens vous réitérer ma décision de faire procéder à la fermeture de ses usines en vertu de la loi du 15 mai, 1864.

En effet, l'article 12 (p. 812, Young), parlant de la demande d'autorisation, y fait mention . . . (3) du lieu et de l'emplacement, (4) de la nature du combustible employé, (5) du genre d'industrie, (6) du plan des localités et de l'atelier à l'echelle de 1:200.

Au chapitre "Contraventions," articles 14 et 15, il est notamment dit :—

"Le Gouvernement pourra en outre ordonner le chômage et faire suspendre la marche de l'usine jusqu'à parfaite exécution des conditions de son autorisation."

Il serait intéressant de faire ressortir que le titre de cette loi porte "Usines et Machines à Vapeur," or, en 1864 les moteurs à pétrole n'étaient pas encore inventés, et qu'en outre à l'article 12 la loi dit :—

"Pour faire usage dans l'avenir de chaudières à vapeur placées à demeure ou pour continuer de faire usage de chaudières précédemment établies, mais non autorisées légalement."

Dans cette seconde phrase la loi est claire, elle y parle de chaudières d'une façon générale sans aucune spécification de vapeur, benzine, ou pétrole.

Du reste, la loi ayant été élaborée pour les usines aussi comme son titre l'indique, et que, d'autre part, il est question dans le texte de la loi "de la nature du combustible et du genre d'industrie," et qu'en somme comme Abdul Ali a ouvert une usine et exploité une industrie sans avoir exécuté les conditions de l'autorisation, il tombe par conséquent sous le coup de la loi. Il n'y avait aucun doute à cet effet dans mon esprit, mais comme dans les entretiens que vous aviez eus avec notre directeur des affaires politiques vous hésitiez à reconnaître la légalité entière de la mesure que je vais prendre contre votre ressortissant, j'ai préféré vous indiquer au préalable le texte de la loi, dont l'interprétation ne peut donner lieu à aucun doute à cet effet.

Je vous prie donc de bien vouloir informer votre ressortissant de ce qui précède et déléguer un employé de votre consulat général pour assister à la fermeture des usines d'Abdul Ali qu'il a exploitées jusqu'aujourd'hui sans avoir eu aucune autorisation des autorités locales.

Veuillez, &c.
Le Gouverneur général,
Commandant de la VI^{e} Armée,
H. NAZIM.

Enclosure 18 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Bagdad.

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, August* 30, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th August, 1910, on the subject of the ice factories at Bagdad owned by Abdul Ali, a British Indian subject.

I have examined the law of the 15th May, 1864, relating to steam factories and engines, and to my mind it is clear that the said law has no bearing at all upon oil engines. Moreover, as your Excellency has yourself pointed out, oil engines did not exist at the time of the passing of the law; and this fact alone seems sufficient to prove that the law in question cannot be held to regulate the case of oil engines, which are quite different in their nature from steam engines. An oil engine has no boiler ("chaudière"), and there is therefore no fear of a boiler explosion—the danger against which the law cited is designed to provide. The motive force of an oil engine is derived from the combustion, at each revolution, of a small quantity of vaporised oil. There is therefore no reason why the same authorisation should be required for an oil engine as for a steam engine; and I think it is clear, besides, that the existing law does not require any authorisation.

Your Excellency also refers to the words "nature of fuel" ("nature du combustible"); but from the context it is evident that the reference is to the fuel used in steam boilers, that is to say, coal or wood.

In these circumstances, I regret that I am unable to accept your Excellency's view of the law, or to make any communication on the subject to the owner of the factories, or to depute any representative from this consulate-general to take part in closing the factories.

Pray accept, &c.
J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 19 in No. 26.

Purport of Telegram from Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Louther.

Bagdad, August 30, 1910.

REFERS to Ambassador's telegram of 27th August, and informs him that on the 28th August Nazim Pasha informed Mr. Lorimer by official letter that, as the factories of the Indian manufacturer, Abdul Ali, were not legally authorised (by the law of 1864), he intended to have them closed. The answer to this contention in the first place, and to Mr. Lorimer's mind a sufficient one, is that it is evident from every clause of the above law of 1864 that the reference is to steam engines and boilers. As regards oil engines, there is no law for such, nor is any required, as an oil engine is smokeless and is not a source of danger. Mr. Lorimer has replied to the vali that he does not assent to the order to close the factories, nor will he send a representative to participate in any closure. The consul-general has not thought it necessary to point out to the vali that, until the present time, the factories had continued to work without objection, and that only when his Excellency attempted unsuccessfully to regulate the price of ice had any objection to the working of the factories been raised. This morning the large factory was visited by police and gendarmerie, and it was threatened with demolition. On a former occasion the employés in the shop were threatened with violence. From 22nd July until 14th August the estimated loss of revenue to Abdul Ali is about £T. 250. The above described incidents are most prejudicial to our national credit here, and the impression they might convey in India might be unfortunate. Mr. Lorimer refers to another case on which he is at present occupied, which concerns a British subject who appears to have been beaten, and 20*l.* taken from him by the Turkish police. Until Constantinople applies effective check here the situation will not improve. Mr. Lorimer asks his Excellency the Ambassador if he is satisfied that the Minister has taken action as promised.

Enclosure 20 in No. 26.

Statement of Faiz Muhammad-ibn-Noor Muhammad, British Subject, in the Service of Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers, Bagdad.

AT about 10 A.M. on Saturday morning (the 28th August) a Turkish soldier named Kathem came to the ice factory and wanted ice at 10 paras a kilogramme, but I refused him, and told him I was directed to sell ice only at 20 paras. The soldier took 9 kilog. of ice, and paid me G.S.P. 4½, and went away.

At about 4 P.M. the same day a Turkish officer named Zakki Bey came to the

factory and asked the price of ice, and I told him that the price was 20 paras. Zakki Bey went away without saying anything further.

About half-an-hour later another Turkish officer came to the factory and entered it. He asked for ice, and I told him the price was 20 paras a kilogramme. He said that he would take it by force from me. I told him that he could not take it from me, as the matter was not in my hands; he had better go to the owner of the goods. He said he would pluck my eyes out and take it, and abused me grossly. I told him that he had no right to abuse me, as the factory belongs to a foreign subject, and if he wanted the ice at 10 paras the kilogramme he should go and buy it from the municipality factory. He replied that so long as the factory was in this country he would take the ice at the same price as that charged at the municipality factory, and, if we did not agree, would remove the factory. I told him that my employers would charge me the full price, and that I was a poor man. Why should he cause me loss?

There was a block and a-half of ice on the counter. The soldier, Kathem, who was with him, weighed the ice, which proved to be 20 kilog. The officer threw a quarter of a méjidie on to the counter and Kathem took up the ice. I told the officer that I would not take the quarter méjidie. He refused to pay me anything more, and I asked him to give me a note to the effect that he has taken 20 kilog. of ice at 10 paras, so that my employers should not charge the difference to me. The officer gave me the attached paper, and I sent it immediately to my masters.

When Mulla Ahmed Ali Khan came to the factory in the evening to record the sales of ice, he told me that since I had allowed the 20 kilog. to go at 10 paras, I would have to pay the difference.

(Signed by Faiz Muhammad in the vernacular).

The foregoing statement was read over to Faiz Muhammad-ibn-Noor Muhammad before signing it, and he declared that it was correct.

J. Calcott Gaskin,
Commercial Assistant.

Bagdad, August 31, 1910.

Translation of the receipt referred to in the Faiz Muhammad's deposition:

I have taken 25 kinyahs of ice for the military restaurant at the Urdu Gah at the rate of 10 paras per kinyah.

(Signed by Lieutenant Muhammad (? illegible), the Idara Ma'amuri of the Urdu Gah (the military camp at the south gate).)

Enclosure 21 in No. 26.

The Vali of Bagdad to Consul-General Lorimer.

M. le Consul général, *Bagdad, le* 18 (31) *août*, 1910.

EN réponse à votre lettre en date d'hier, j'ai l'honneur de vous informer que j'ai pris connaissance de l'interprétation que vous donnez à la loi du 15 mai, 1864, que vous trouvez inapplicable aux machines à pétrole.

Il y a entre nous une grande divergence de vue quant à l'interprétation de cette loi; cette divergence provient surtout de ce que vous ne me répondez pas directement aux autres points que j'avais cités dans ma précédente lettre. J'avais pourtant fait ces citations dans l'intention bien déterminée de vous convaincre que la loi précitée était parfaitement applicable à votre ressortissant. Aussi, pour éviter tout malentendu, je viens vous prier de bien vouloir me répondre aux deux questions suivantes:—

1. Abdul Ali exploite-t-il une usine?
2. Abdul Ali possède-t-il une autorisation pour exploiter son usine?

Si vous voulez bien reconnaître qu'Abdul Ali exploite actuellement une usine à glace et qu'il ne possède pas d'autorisation pour l'exploitation de cette usine, Abdul Ali tombe sous le coup de la loi du 15 mai, 1864, parce que cette loi n'a pas été créée uniquement pour la réglementation des usines à machines à vapeur, mais pour des usines et machines à vapeur, ainsi que son titre l'indique.

Je vous serais très obligé de me répondre le plus tôt possible à ma présente, afin que

je puisse faire appliquer la loi sans qu'un malentendu puisse exister à ce sujet entre votre consulat général et ce vilayet.

Veuillez, &c.
Le Gouverneur général,
Commandant de la VI^e Armée,
H. NAZIM.

Enclosure 22 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Bagdad.

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, September* 2, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 31st August, 1910, relating to the ice factories of the British subject, Abdul Ali, at Bagdad, and to say that, after full consideration, I still adhere to my former view, that the law of the 15th May, 1864, does not and cannot apply to his case.

The title of the law in the original Turkish is very clear; it is the French translation which is ambiguous. In Turkish the law is called "Regulations regarding Stationary Steam-engines," and the word "factories" does not so much as occur in its title.

I would also draw your Excellency's attention to the fact that every operative article of the law, viz., articles Nos. 1 to 15 inclusive, contains the word "boiler" or "boilers," except articles 10 and 11, which refer to the capital only. Now, oil-engines have no boilers. This argument seems to me conclusive in favour of my interpretation.

As no agreement has been reached here on the subject of the applicability of this law, I have the honour to suggest that your Excellency should refer the question to the Sublime Porte, as I have already done to the British Embassy at Constantinople. International courtesy, I think, requires that the *status quo* of the factories should remain undisturbed until the doubtful point has been settled by the superior authorities.

Nevertheless, if your Excellency considers that either of Abdul Ali's factories is defective in any respect, I shall willingly confer on this subject with any representative whom your Excellency may be pleased to appoint, in order that the defects, if serious, may be remedied.

Pray accept, &c.
J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 23 in No. 26.

Memorandum by Mr. Gaskin.

ABDUL ALI gives me the following sums as expended by him on his ice factories:—

		£T.	£T.
1. Small factory at Bagdad—			
Ice-machine	.. ..	650	
Flour-mill	.. ..	60	
Cost of buildings	.. ..	200	
Ground-rent for ten years, paid in advance	.. .. ..	80	
		——	970
2. Large factory at Bagdad—			
Ice machine	.. ..	1,155	
Flour-mill	.. ..	300	
Pumping plant	.. ..	70	
Cost of buildings	.. ..	400	
Cost of site	.. ..	200	
		——	2,125
3. Factory at Karbala—			
Ice machine	.. ..	680	
Flour-mill	.. ..	60	
Cost of buildings	.. ..	200	
Ground-rent for ten years	.. ..	300	
		——	1,240
Total	.. ..		4,335

J. C. GASKIN.

September 3, 1910.

Enclosure 24 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Louther.

(No. 776/42. Confidential.)

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, September 5, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to refer in the present despatch to a subject upon which I have been obliged to address your Excellency several times by telegram—that, namely, of the recent proceedings of the Vali of Bagdad in relation to immovable property owned by British subjects here.

Your Excellency is aware of some of the projects which Nazim Pasha has formed since his arrival for the improvement of the city of Bagdad. These have been mentioned in my monthly summaries of events (see specially Summary for July 1910, III, 1, and VIII, 1, 2), and in their conception they are, perhaps, not altogether amiss; but the manner in which the vali has so far endeavoured to give effect to them is irregular and oppressive. The contemplated improvements consist chiefly in the laying out of new streets and the widening of old ones—processes which involve the partial or entire destruction of many existing houses and shops.

The laws of the Ottoman Empire governing such operations are the Expropriation Law of the 15th May, 1879, and the Building Law of the 22nd August, 1891.* The only provisions of these laws to which at the present stage it is necessary to refer are articles 3, 4, 8, 14, and 17 of the former and 1 and 2 of the latter. By these it is required, briefly, that a plan of the immovable property to be taken shall be prepared and exhibited; that the amount of the valuation shall be publicly notified in various ways; that the proprietor shall be allowed fifteen days to lodge objections; that if he does not accept the official valuation he shall be sued at law; and, finally, that until either he has accepted the official valuation or a decree has been obtained against him in a competent court he shall not be deprived of his property.

All these indispensable formalities and conditions seem to have been disregarded in the attempted execution of Nazim Pasha's schemes; and a number of houses and shops, of which the débris now render some of the main streets impassable, have already been partially or wholly destroyed without warrant of law. No one seems to be aware of the existence of any plan, though the engineers have possibly taken measurements; and the vali's political secretary in fact admitted to me that no plan had been prepared,† in consequence of there being no proper drawing-office, and that the work was simply being carried on by eye. In the cases of which I have personally any cognisance, no regular notice has been given to the proprietors; no compensation has been tendered to them; the period prescribed by law has not been allowed them for lodging objections; and they have not been summoned before any court. The truth is, that the Bagdad municipality has not at the present moment funds to pay for expropriations, and that the vali is too impatient to wait until the money has been obtained, whether by raising a loan or otherwise.

The uncertainty as to the exact course of Nazim Pasha's devastating improvements and the rapidity with which his orders are carried out by Lieutenant-Colonel Javad Bey, a military engineer whom he has made director in municipal affairs, have greatly alarmed the house and shop proprietors of Bagdad.‡ No one feels sure that a new road through his house or shop may not be begun at an instant's notice; and I am assured that, as a consequence of the feeling of insecurity which has been created, neither purchasers nor mortgagees of immovable property are now forthcoming, upon any terms, at Bagdad. The unceremonious demolition of the German club's garden,§ and the preparations for making a street across the middle of the British residency compound, as an approach to a public park which was to be laid out beyond,‖ were proceedings connected with the vali's improvements.

So long as the demolitions did not affect British interests I remained a spectator of the above high-handed proceedings—nominally of the municipality, really of the vali. The arbitrary demolitions were the work of Nazim Pasha and Javad Bey, who refused, so I have been confidentially informed by the late acting president of the municipality

* Young's "Corps de Droit ottoman," VI, 127–151 and 137–148.

† Since this was written the vali's political secretary has informed me (on the 5th September) that a plan has been prepared. I have asked to be allowed to inspect it. The plan has probably been prepared now in consequence of the discussions which have arisen.—J. G. L.

‡ See also the enclosures to my despatch No. 768/38, dated September 3, 1910.

§ See my telegram to your Excellency of August , 1910.

‖ See my despatch No. 773/40 of September 3, 1910, and the earlier ones of the same series.

himself, to pay the slightest attention to the restraining advice of the municipal committee. But it presently became apparent that the following properties of British or British Indian subjects were in imminent danger of arbitrary destruction or encroachment:—

1. A wall and six shops belonging to Messrs. S. Lynch and Co.
2. The main offices of the same British firm.
3. A khan, or enclosed warehouse, belonging to the same firm.
4. A house belonging to the estate of the late Nawab Ikbal-ed-Dowleh, a prominent British Indian subject, and the descendant of a royal family.
5. A shop owned by Mr. G. Thaddeus, an Armenian British subject and pensioner, formerly accountant in the British Residency, Bagdad.
6. A house, the property of Nawab Ahmad Ali Khan, deceased, lately social head of the British Indian community at Bagdad.
7. A house belonging to Nawab Muhammad Taki Khan, nephew and stepson of the said Ahmad Ali Khan.

I immediately opened a correspondence with the vilayat on the subject of this menace to the rights of our people; and the copies of the letters exchanged, which are annexed to this despatch, speak for themselves. (The passages in the enclosures relating to expropriation without compensation, in certain circumstances, may be omitted, in reading, at this stage.) It will be seen that, on the 2nd August, the vali flatly refused to discuss the matter of the threatened properties with me, on the ground that the intervention of foreign consular officers in questions of immovable property was irregular. As a matter of fact, it was not the application of the Turkish law, but its violation, against which I was preparing to protest; and this the vilayat understood perfectly well. Seeing, however, that there was no chance of my arguments receiving consideration at Bagdad, I thought it better to desist from useless and irritating local discussions, and to proceed, thereafter, entirely by means of telegraphic references to your Excellency.

I need not enter on further details of what occurred, these having been regularly reported to your Excellency by telegram. Suffice it to say that ultimately, on the 7th and 8th August, Messrs. Lynch's wall and shops (No. 1 in the list above) were forcibly dismantled by municipal employés; and that the part of the Ikbal-ed-Dowleh house (No. 4 in the list) nearest to the street was demolished in the same manner at about the same time. Both of these buildings had been condemned as dangerous, it was said, by the municipality; but no proper notice was given to the manager in the one case or to the trustees in the other, and no opportunity was allowed them of raising legal objections or of undertaking repairs, supposing the latter to be really required. The Ikbal-ed-Dowleh house was old and possibly somewhat insecure; but Messrs. Lynch's wall and shops were in perfectly good condition, as personally ascertained by myself and Mr. Gaskin, the commercial assistant in this residency, who has had much experience of house building, and who himself constructed the large British political agency house at Manamah in Bahrain. The object in both these cases was the same, viz., to obtain land for widening a street without payment, by first demolishing a façade and then filching not only the land on which the façade had stood, but also a valuable strip of building ground lying behind. (I have never in my experience, I may say, encountered a more flagrant example than this of abuse of the law by those whose duty it is to protect and enforce it.) Mr. Thaddeus' shop (No. 5 in the list) has also, I understand, been condemned as dangerous, and lies under sentence of destruction; but I am in hope that the measures which have been taken by your Excellency at Constantinople may avail to save it. It is like Messrs. Lynch's wall and shops, is in perfectly good condition; and I have taken the precaution of securing certificates to this effect from the native master builders, who were not informed of the purpose for which their opinions were required. Besides those I have obtained a detailed report on the subject from Mr. Gaskin, which is among the enclosures to this despatch.

The other threatened buildings mentioned above (Nos. 2, 3, 6, and 7) are still standing; but a police station which was next door to Nawab Muhammad Taki's house has been levelled with the ground, and a small incision has been made in the wall of the house itself, which is naturally a cause of anxiety to the owner. It is impossible, in the absence of precise information regarding the intentions of the street-makers, who, as already remarked, have not explained them by means of a published plan as the law requires,* and whose own ideas I have reason to think are somewhat

* See, however, the marginal note above about a plan having now been prepared.—J. G. L.

changeable, to form any close estimate of the damage likely to be caused to British subjects if all the demolitions at present apprehended are carried out. A rough estimate by Mr. Gaskin is appended, in which the probable loss is estimated at £T. 4,335; but this may prove to be either an under-estimate or an over-estimate, according to the action eventually taken by the Turks.

I should add that the Mutessarif of Karbala is busily copying Nazim Pasha's methods in the town at which he has his seat (see Summary for July 1910, II, 2); that the same irregular proceedings have been commenced there; and that there also British Indian subjects are likely to be sufferers.

It is necessary to refer to a point of Turkish law which will inevitably arise in connection even with expropriations legally undertaken, viz., the meaning of article 8 of the Building Law of the 22nd August, 1891. At Bussorah, in connection with the partial demolition last winter of a building belonging to the Faiz-i-Husaini, a wealthy pilgrimage association of Indian Bohrahs, it was, I am informed, contended by the vali that under the said article a portion not exceeding one-fourth in depth of an immovable property, even a house, could be taken without payment of any compensation properly so called, only the expense of reconstructing the front, interior, &c., upon the new line of street being debitable to the expropriating authority. I understand, however, that this view is not accepted by all lawyers; and it seems to me that the article is not applicable unless there is a question of the proprietor's constructing new buildings or undertaking fundamental repairs to an existing building, which is not the case in regard to the buildings now threatened or already demolished at Bagdad. The meaning of the French translation given in Young seems to me, however, far from plain*; and I have not been able, with the assistance of two very competent dragomans, to understand quite clearly the sense even of the Turkish original. I gather that the legal advisers of Messrs. Lynch are inclined to think that the article referred to applies only to lands not built upon; but to myself, I confess, this interpretation seems to err in the opposite direction from that adopted by the Turkish authorities at Bussorah, and indeed to be untenable.

If it is a fact that the existing Turkish law authorises the seizure of one-fourth of an individual's property without payment of any compensation whatever—in other words, its confiscation—I submit with the utmost deference that there are strong grounds for protesting against the existence, or at least the enforcement, of such a barbarous regulation. It is easy to imagine cases in which its application would involve the most cruel hardship. A building might be already of the smallest possible depth, when, if one-fourth were taken from it, the remainder would lose all its value; moreover, the building might be the owner's whole property. I venture to draw your Excellency's attention in this connection to the detailed description of Nawab Muhammad Taki's house at Bagdad, which forms an enclosure to this despatch.

Another absurdity of the present Turkish building law are the provisions that the land required for widening a street shall be taken equally from both sides,† and that all streets shall be of a certain fixed breadth throughout.‡ The bad consequences of these provisions are obvious, and one of the streets now undergoing enlargement at Bagdad will, if the law is observed, afford an example of them on a large scale. In the case of this street, it will apparently be necessary to knock down the fronts of a series of high buildings (including Messrs. Lynch's main offices and khan, the principal hotel at Bagdad, &c.) on both sides for a distance of perhaps a quarter of a-mile. These facts do not seem to have been taken into consideration by the local authorities when they demolished the Ikbal-ed-Dowleh house and Messrs. Lynch's wall and shops forming part of the street in question. Why should land be taken from those properties only, when the law requires that half the land shall be taken from the properties opposite them, and that the other premises situated in the street must be dealt with similarly in order to give the street a uniform breadth from end to end?

For the reasons explained above, I suggest very respectfully that your Excellency should endeavour to obtain a suitable modification of the present Turkish building law, which is unworthy of a civilised country; and that your Excellency should move the Porte to prohibit in the meantime the application of the existing rules, which are working widespread ruin in Bagdad. Many small shop-keepers, Ottoman subjects, have, I am credibly informed, been reduced to bankruptcy by Nazim Pasha's operations; and your Excellency's successful intervention would be welcomed not only by British subjects, but also by those of the Porte, whose losses are likely to be out of all proportion to those of British subjects, substantial as the latter may be.

* "Corps de Droit ottoman," VI, 139.

† Article 6. ‡ Article 1.

I do not wish to add to the contents of an already overburdened despatch; but I cannot refrain from remarking here that the manner in which the local Government of Bagdad have abused their freedom in matters of immovable property is a valuable commentary on the desire of the Porte to obtain a relaxation of the Capitulations bearing upon the personal rights of foreigners. I shall have more to say on the subject of the Capitulations in a later despatch, in which I shall be obliged to trouble your Excellency with an account of what appears to be a serious outrage lately committed upon a British Indian subject at Bagdad by the Turkish police.

As British Indian subjects are affected, I am submitting a copy of this despatch and its enclosures to the Government of India. I do not think, however, that the Government of India will wish to see the purports of my telegraphic correspondence with your Excellency, mainly on the subject of Messrs. Lynch's premises; and I have therefore omitted them from the enclosures.

I trust that I may be fortunate enough to secure your Excellency's approval of my conduct of this case so far as it has yet proceeded.

I have, &c.

J. G. LORIMER, I.C.S.,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

Enclosure 25 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Bagdad.

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, July* 18, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that I have received an application for assistance from Mr. T. W. Parry, the representative of Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co. at Bagdad, in which he states that he is informed that it is intended by the municipality to demolish a wall, some shops, and possibly other buildings as well, belonging to his firm, on the ground that they are in a dangerous condition.

Mr. Parry states that he has received no formal notice on the subject, but that he is told that the work will be proceeded with at once. He disputes the allegation that the structures are in a dangerous state.

In these circumstances, as Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co. are a British firm, I would request your Excellency kindly to inform me which buildings of Messrs. Lynch's it is intended to demolish, and to give orders that demolition should be postponed until this consulate-general has had an opportunity to enquire into and understand the facts.

Pray accept, &c.

J. G. LORIMER.

Endorsement dated July 18, 1910.

A copy of the foregoing is sent to Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co. for information with reference to their letter dated the 18th July, 1910.

J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 26 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Bagdad.

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, July* 22, 1910.

WITH a view of avoiding difficulties at the last moment, I have the honour to request that you will very kindly inform me whether any land or buildings belonging to British subjects will be required in connection with the public improvements which are now being carried out at Bagdad. I should be glad to know at the same time the official estimate which has been placed on the property of each with a view to compensation, and to be referred to the particular law under which expropriation will take place. In this manner, everything can be satisfactorily arranged in advance between the vilayet and this consulate-general.

Pray accept, &c.

J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 27 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to M. Eram Bey.

(Private.)
Dear M. Eram Bey, *Bagdad, July* 26, 1910.

I ENCLOSE an invitation for Major Najib Bey, which you will perhaps have the kindness to pass to him, as I do not know his address.

With reference to our conversation this morning, may I recapitulate the chief points of what I then tried to say to you?

I do not wish to support British subjects in any unreasonable claims, but, in a case in which it appeared to me that one of them was not being treated in accordance with the principles of natural justice, I should consider it my duty to take action. It would not be enough for me, in order to abstain, that the municipal or other authorities were proceeding under the Turkish law; it would also be necessary that the law in question should be in harmony with natural justice and with the usage of the most advanced nations. Thus, if it should be proposed to destroy or acquire the property of a British subject without paying full compensation, I should feel myself obliged to move in the matter.

My first step would naturally be to approach his Excellency on the subject; but, if his Excellency thought my intervention improper, or if, while allowing my intervention, he found himself unable to grant relief, I should see no alternative to referring the matter to the British Embassy at Constantinople. Of course, I should do so in a spirit and terms perfectly amicable to the Bagdad Local Government, with whom I hope always to preserve the best relations, official as well as private.

For myself, I cannot think that the enlightened Ottoman Government of to-day would wish to enforce a law, passed in other times, which apparently authorises the confiscation of immovable property up to a limit of one-fourth without any compensation.

The value of property so taken might amount to hundreds or thousands of pounds, and cases are imaginable in which the loss of it might ruin the owner. It seems to me very desirable, if it is possible, that provisional arrangements should be made at Bagdad, pending new legislation, to meet in some way the case of the present expropriations.

You may rely on my doing my best to accommodate matters in any way in which I can without exposing British subjects to what, from my point of view, appears to be inequitable treatment.

Believe me, yours very truly,
J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 28 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Bagdad.

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, July* 28, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you two petitions from British subjects in regard to the proposed destruction of property belonging to them by the municipality of Bagdad.

In so doing, I beg to confirm their statements that I have personally visited the premises in question, and have assured myself that neither of them is in a dangerous condition.

Pray accept, &c.
J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 29 in No. 26.

Petition addressed to the Vali of Bagdad, dated July 28, 1910.

(Translation.)
Your Excellency,

AN employé of the municipality recently visited the premises of Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co. at Bagdad, whose local manager I am, and stated that a wall and six shops, forming part of the said premises, were in a dangerous condition, and would be

demolished shortly by the municipality. I was not informed under what law or regulation, if any, it was proposed to take this action.

With reference to the statement of the employé, I beg respectfully to assure your Excellency that the wall and shops are perfectly safe. That they are not dangerous is known to the British consul-general, who has inspected them personally. The shops were built only four years ago, and they have been kept in proper repair ever since. Any repairs that may be required in future will be carried out by me to the satisfaction of the municipality.

I therefore respectfully beg your Excellency to restrain the municipality from the unjustifiable action which they apparently intend to take against my employers, a British commercial firm.

T. W. PARRY.

Enclosure 30 in No. 26.

Petition addressed to the Vali of Bagdad, dated July 25, 1910.

Your Excellency,

AN employé of the municipality recently visited the premises occupied by Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers, British Indian merchants, at their principal shop at Bagdad, and informed them that the said premises were in a dangerous condition, and would be demolished at once by the municipality. The premises in question are my property, and Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers are my tenants. I am not aware under what law or regulation, if any, it is proposed to take this action.

With reference to the statement of the employé, I beg respectfully to assure your Excellency that the premises are perfectly safe, that they are not dangerous is known to the British consul-general, who has inspected them personally.

I therefore respectfully beg your Excellency to restrain the municipality from the unjustifiable action which they apparently intend to take against me, a British subject residing at Bagdad.

GABRIEL THADDEUS.

Enclosure 31 in No. 26.

M. Eram Bey to Consul-General Lorimer.

Cher Mr. Lorimer, *Bagdad, le* 15 (28) *juillet*, 1910.

HIER soir j'ai été chez son Excellence pour l'entretenir expressément de la question de l'expropriation. Le Gouverneur général partage entièrement ma façon de voir.

Je lui ai longuement expliqué votre point de vue, et notamment votre sentiment; je dis "sentiment," car en somme, étant donné que la loi ne vous confère aucun droit d'immixtion en faveur des sujets britanniques, c'est votre conscience que vous faites intervenir, puisque vous trouvez la loi ottomane, en matière foncière, peu en rapport "with the principles of natural justice."

C'est une affaire d'appréciation où le point de vue joue un rôle considérable.

Vous pouvez, certes, vous référer à votre Ambassadeur à Constantinople pour attirer son attention là-dessus, et votre démarche ne sera nullement considérée par nous comme inamicale ou hostile au vilayet, puisqu'elle ne constitue qu'un avertissement contre une loi existante reconnue par des traités.

Cela n'empêchera évidemment pas la continuation des bons rapports de ce vilayet tant officiels que privés avec votre consulat général.

Je vous préviens très sincèrement que, de mon côté, je vais répondre à votre lettre officielle en soutenant de toutes mes forces le principe de la non-intervention des représentants consulaires en matière immobilière, ainsi que notre indépendance absolue dans l'application intégrale des mesures—conformes aux lois en vigueur—que prendra notre municipalité dans un intérêt public. Cette application devant atteindre dans la même mesure, en toute justice et sans aucune distinction, tant les sujets étrangers que ceux de cet Empire.

Vous avez été franc et sincère; je vous en remercie au nom de ce vilayet.

Du reste, je pense comme vous que des entrevues privées et des échanges de vue faits, au préalable, évitent bien souvent des malentendus, débluient la situation tout en éclairant la conscience des deux parties.

Pour ce qui concerne la défense d'exporter des céréales et des chevaux et mules, je m'empresse de vous informer qu'il n'y a aucune prohibition.

Je profite de cette occasion pour vous prier, s'il vous était possible, de nous envoyer samedi prochain, après-demain, vers 11 heures (à la franque), un soldat indien avec son turban bien lié. Notre état-major serait désireux d'étudier cette coiffure, qui pourrait bien convenir à nos troupes.

Mille excuses pour tout ce dérangement, et veuillez croire, &c.

E. ERAM.

Enclosure 32 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to M. Eram Bey.

(Demi-official.)

Dear M. Eram Bey, *Bagdad, July* 28, 1910.

I AM sorry to be obliged to trouble you every day with another letter, but the reason is that someone comes to me daily with a fresh request for consular assistance.

Yesterday Abdul Ali, the British Indian merchant, was informed by a municipal employé that his principal shop was in a dangerous condition and must be pulled down at once. I went to-day and found the shop was no more dangerous than the wall and shops belonging to Messrs. S. Lynch and Co., about which we had a conversation lately. The shop now in question is the property of Mr. G. Thaddeus, a British subject, formerly accountant in this consulate-general and now retired on pension.

I am forwarding to his Excellency this day petitions from Messrs. Lynch's manager (Mr. Parry) and Mr. G. Thaddeus, in which they pray that the municipality may be restrained from taking the action against them which seems to be contemplated.

To-day I learn that an order has been published that oil engines are not to work within the municipal area in future. This order, if enforced, would stop the flour mills of Messrs. Blockey, Cree and Messrs. Solomon and Blaney, who are British subjects. But according to the best information I can obtain, such an order is not warranted by any Turkish law or regulation; and if that is the case, the order must, I think, be regarded as void of effect. Pending a discussion of its legality, I consider that the British subjects are at liberty to continue working their mills. The matter, as you will observe, is not one of immovable property but of commercial rights, and as such it is subject to the intervention of this consulate-general.

I also hear a rumour—it is not more than a rumour at present—that it is the intention of the municipality to demolish part of two valuable houses belonging to British Indian subjects for the purpose of widening a street; and that the loss to the proprietors may in this case amount to thousands of liras.

As I said before, I am very sorry to be so persistent in my representations; but, as you will understand, I cannot refuse to support the just claims of British subjects when they are submitted to me.

Yours very truly,

J. G. LORIMER

Enclosure 33 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Bagdad.

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, August* 3, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for the favour of your orders, a petition from Agha Muhammad Hasan Khan and Agha Khidar, two British subjects, in regard to property of Nawab Ikbal-ed-Dowleh, deceased, a British subject, whose trustees they are.

Pray accept, &c.

J. G. LORIMER, I.C.S.

Enclosure 34 in No. 26.

Pétition dated August 3, 1910, *from the Trustees of the Estate of the Deceased Nawab Ikbal-ed-Doulch to the Vali of Bagdad.*

Your Excellency,

WE who are the trustees of the estate of the deceased Nawab Ikbal-ed-Dowleh, a British subject, and who are ourselves British subjects, beg to approach your Excellency with reference to a house belonging to the said estate, situated in the same street as the Bagdad municipality offices but on the opposite side of it, adjoining a house which is the property of Khojah Danus.

The front wall belonging to this house was demolished a short time ago at the instance of the municipality, whose engineer had condemned it as dangerous. It was, in truth, an old wall, and we do not wish to make any retrospective objection with reference to its demolition.

What we wish to bring to your Excellency's notice is that the municipality, since the demolition of the wall, have demanded of us the land upon which the wall formerly stood, and also some land which lay behind it, apparently for the purpose of widening the street. When land is required in such circumstances as these, there are, as your Excellency is aware, certain formalities prescribed in the Law regarding the Construction and Alignment of Streets of the 22nd August, 1891, which the municipality are bound to observe, and which in the present case they have neglected.

Thus, under article 8 of the law quoted, the land required for widening a street must not be taken on one side only, but equally from both sides; whereas, in the present case, the whole of the land needed is apparently being taken from us and none of it from the proprietors on the opposite side of the street.

Again, under article 12 of the same law, we should be given an opportunity of studying the engineering plans for the widening of the street, and thirty-one days ought to be allowed us in which to present our objections. Up to the present we have not been shown any plan, and our objections have not been invited or considered.

In the third place, under article 13 of the same law, if the municipality require us to construct the front of our buildings on an alignment behind that at which it previously existed, they are bound to carry out the reconstruction of the front at their own expense or to pay us the estimated cost of reconstruction, so that we may carry it out ourselves. These conditions the Bagdad municipality have apparently, in the present case, no intention of fulfilling.

We therefore respectfully pray your Excellency to issue such orders to the municipality as will prevent their encroaching on the land of the estate in question without the necessary legal formalities, and such as will ensure their reconstructing the front of our building—if it should be decided, after the proper legal formalities, to take the land—or paying to us the cost of reconstruction.

And your Excellency's petitioners will ever pray, &c.

AGHA MUHAMAD HASAN KHAN.
AGHA KHIDAR.

Enclosure 35 in No. 26.

The Vali of Bagdad to Consul-General Lorimer.

M. le Consul général, *Bagdad, le 20 août*, 1910.

J'AI l'honneur d'accuser réception de vos lettres des 18 et 20 juillet, par lesquelles vous venez m'entretenir d'une demande d'assistance qui vous est adressée par un de vos ressortissants au sujet d'une question immobilière. Vous me demandez en outre de vous remettre une liste de tous les immeubles, appartenant à des sujets britanniques, susceptibles de démolition ou d'expropriation, avec la valeur assignée à chaque immeuble par nos experts municipaux. Vous me prier en outre de faire ajourner la démolition éventuelle d'immeubles appartenant à des sujets britanniques jusqu'à ce que votre consulat général ait eu le temps de faire une enquête.

Toute pénible que la chose me soit, je suis au regret de devoir vous répondre par un refus à tout ce que vous demandez, et cela en vertu des lois en vigueur, qui n'admettent aucune sorte d'intervention étrangère dans nos affaires immobilières.

Vous n'ignorez pas, M. le consul général, que malgré les privilèges des Capitulations, les étrangers avaient été durant très longtemps exclus du droit de propriété immobilière, et ce n'est qu'en 1867 que nos Sultans leur concédèrent enfin le droit de posséder dans cet Empire des biens immeubles, mais à la condition expresse que ces étrangers ne fussent admis à jouir de ce droit qu'au même titre que les sujets ottomans et sans autre condition. (Loi du 13 septembre, 1284.)

Ce principe fondamental une fois établi et si nous considérons ensemble la question sous un autre point de vue, je ne devrais m'attendre de votre part, qui représentez à Bagdad le délégué d'une nation amie ayant accueilli avec la joie la plus entière et très sincère l'établissement du régime constitutionnel, je ne devrais m'attendre, dis-je, qu'à un concours amical. Or, vous n'ignorez pas, M. le consul général, que les efforts de notre Gouvernement central tendant à hâter autant que possible le moment de l'abrogation des privilèges concédés par les Capitulations.

Dans ces conditions l'intervention d'un représentant consulaire dans l'unique branche de notre administration où nous jouissons d'une complète indépendance dans l'application de nos lois à l'égard des étrangers, et au moment où nous n'épargnons aucun effort pour la réorganisation et l'embellissement de cette ville, cette intervention, vous en conviendrez aisément, ne peut nous laisser qu'une impression de pénible étonnement.

Depuis mon arrivée à Bagdad, je n'ai manqué aucune occasion pour vous témoigner combien j'étais heureux des relations amicales qui existent entre votre consulat général et ce vilayet.

Mais puisque aujourd'hui il s'agit d'intervention et que celle-ci ne peut avoir lieu dans le sens que vous désirez l'appliquer, ne serait-il pas plus opportun qu'en témoignage de l'amitié britannique—dont je sais apprécier toute la valeur—vous employiez cette intervention auprès de vos ressortissants en les exhortant d'éviter de nous créer des difficultés et surtout en leur faisant bien comprendre que les efforts que nous déployons pour la bonne organisation et l'embellissement de cette ville tendent vers un intérêt public et qui est commun tant aux étrangers qu'aux ottomans? Cette réorganisation procurera de travail à tout le monde, créera des débouchés pour toutes les industries en contribuant nécessairement à relever le commerce de Bagdad, ce dont les pays étrangers importateurs seront les premiers à bénéficier. Or, comme la Grande-Bretagne vient en tête par son commerce de transit, il me devient aisé d'avoir recours à son représentant pour l'engager et le prier d'employer son influence auprès de ses ressortissants afin qu'ils coopèrent sincèrement à l'œuvre de réorganisation que nous voulons entreprendre rapidement, tout en appliquant rigoureusement et avec justice les lois et règlements en vigueur.

J'aime à espérer que vous trouverez légitimes les considérations que je viens d'avoir l'honneur de vous exposer, étant moi-même sûr des sentiments que vous nourrissez envers ce pays et des vœux sincères que vous formulez pour son rapide relèvement.

Veuillez, &c.
Le Gouverneur général,
Commandant de la VI^e^ Armée,
H. NAZIM.

Enclosure 36 in No. 26.

Memorandum by Mr. Gaskin.

I HAVE inspected the shop belonging to Mr. Gabriel Thaddeus, rented to Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers.

The road frontage of the shop to the east is about 10 metres long, and the depth is about 9·20 metres. The front half of the shop is raised on a plinth about 35 centim. high. The walls on the front and the north side are built of wooden uprights, with bricks and gypsum mortar between, and are about 15 centim. thick, and pierced by two doors and two windows. On the north side the wall has been strengthened by an addition of a brick to the thickness on the inside of the shop.

The adjoining house runs into the shop at the south-west corner, and occupies roughly about 21 square dhra's ma'mari of the internal space. The actual area of the shop I judge to be about 120 square dhra's ma'mari. Owing to its central position, the ground is worth about 6 Turkish liras per square dhra ma'mari. The walls, roof, &c., cost about £ T. 60.

The widening of the road will in no way add to the value of the property. Whatever is appropriated from the shop for the road will not be made good to the proprietor by any increase in the value of the remaining portion, because the shop is already small, and, if the area is reduced, its usefulness will be further limited, and consequently the value will fall in proportion; hence, whatever is taken for the road should be rated at a figure which will compensate the proprietor for a fall in the value of his property, and not at the rate given above, which is the value of the property under the existing conditions.

Two years ago the shop was rented to Messrs. Abdul Ali Brothers for a term of five years, at £ T. 20 a-year. The rent of the shop is to-day greater. Rent which represents 3 per cent. interest on the cost of the property is considered good here. On this basis the value of the shop is £ T. 666 at the lowest estimation.

I understand that the ground now occupied by the shop was originally owned by three persons, and that these were bought out by Mr. Thaddeus at different times at a cost, including law expenses, of about £ T. 290; and Mr. Thaddeus has spent about £ T. 50 on converting the premises into a shop. He values the shop at £ T. 1,000, because he has now been offered a rent of £ T. 35 a-year for it.

The condition of the wall on the road is very good, and it will stand many years without needing repairs. There is no question of its being in a condition dangerous to the public. It has no superstructure.

J. CALCOTT GASKIN,
Commercial Assistant.

Bagdad, August 19, 1910.

Enclosure 37 in No. 26.

Memorandum by Mr. Gaskin.

I HAVE inspected the house owned by Nawab Muhammad Taki. I found that it has a frontage of about 15¾ metres and a depth of 6¾ metres. It is stated that the foundations go down about 5 metres and are about 1¼ metres thick. The lower 3 metres are built of bricks and mud, costing about G.S.P. 55 the cubic metre. The upper 2 metres are of bricks, ashes, and lime, costing about G.S.P. 70 the cubic metre.

The wall above the foundation to the first floor is about 3½ metres high and 1 metre thick on the average. The lower 1½ metres are built of bricks, ashes, and lime, costing about G.S.P. 70 per cubic metre; the rest of the wall is of solid bricks and gypsum mortar, costing about G.S.P. 105 the cubic metre.

The walls of three sides of the first floor are about 4 metres high and ½-metre thick, and are built of solid brick and gypsum, also costing about G.S.P. 108 the cubic metre.

On the ground floor at the north end there are a kitchen and a store room; at the south end there is a sirdáb (residential cellar) with marble floor.

On the first floor over the kitchen, &c., there are a room with a shahnishin (projecting window) and a small room with a kafishkan over it. Over the sirdáb there is a large room having one side entirely of woodwork and glass, and a shahnishin overlooking the road.

The area of the ground is over 160 square dhra's ma'mari, and is worth about 2 Turkish liras the square dhra.

The house is quite new, having been built only about six or seven years ago. It has been built well and solidly throughout; apparently no expense has been spared; and it would probably last for generations without repairs except to the woodwork. Taking into consideration the depth to which the foundations have been carried, owing to the close proximity of the river, and to the pains that have been taken to make the house lasting, I think that the house and ground is well worth from £ T. 750 to £ T. 800.

Nawab Muhammad Taki states that the ground was bought for about £ T. 200, and that he spent over £ T. 530 in building it.

As stated above the breadth of the house is only 6¾ metres, and it is obvious that, if a couple of metres are taken along the frontage to add to the breadth of the road, what will remain will be of no use for a dwelling and will have to be converted into shops, to the loss of the proprietor. Recently a number of new shops have been added

to those already existing, and, if the process of widening the roads continue, the number will be so increased that it will have the effect of lowering their value and their rent generally.

J. CALCOTT GASKIN,
Commercial Assistant.

Bagdad, August 24, 1910.

Enclosure 38 in No. 26.

SUMMARY of Losses likely to be incurred by British Subjects through the demolition of their Premises.

(A.) Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co.—			
1. Large yard—	G.S.P.	G.S.P.	
Demolition of walls and shops	15,336		
Ground likely to be appropriated	64,152		
		79,488	
2. Offices—			
Wall, windows, &c.	30,003		
Ground likely to be appropriated	46,701		
	76,704		
Reconstructing sardabs, offices, &c.	77,997		
		154,701	
3. Hajie Khan—			
Walls	11,418		
Ground likely to be appropriated	36,450		
Reconstructing warehouses	15,582		
		63,460	
		297,639	
(B.) Estate of the late Nawab Ikbal-ed-Dowleh—			
Walls, &c.	8,949		
Ground likely to be appropriated	27,792		
Reconstructing sardabs and rooms	26,851		
		65,592	
(C.) Mr. Gabriel Thaddeus' shop—			
Front wall	1,620		
Ground likely to be appropriated	10,122		
		11,742	
(D.) Estate of the late Nawab Ahmad Ali Khan—			
Walls, shahnishins, &c.	16,623		
Ground likely to be appropriated	19,764		
Reconstruction of ground and first floor	48,177		
		84,564	
(E.) Nawab Muhammad Taki's house—			
Value of house	86,400		
Deduct value of ground not appropriated	23,771		
		62,629	
Total		522,166	

G.S.P. 522,166 = £ T. 4,834 and G.S.Ps. 94.

SUMMARY.

	G.S.P.	£ T.	G.S.P.
(A.) Messrs. Lynch	297,639 =	2,755	99
(B.) Ikbal-ed-Dowleh	65,592	607	36
(C.) Mr. Thaddeus	11,742	108	78
(D.) Nawab Ahmad Ali Khan	84,564	783	00
(E.) Nawab Muhammad Taki	62,629	579	97
Total	522,166 =	4,834	94

NOTES.—1. The breadth allowed for along the road on Messrs. Lynch's side is 3 metres.
2. Along Nawab Ahmad Ali Khan's frontage 2 metres have been allowed.
3. ,, Nawab Muhammad Taki's frontage 1¼ metres have been allowed.
4. ,, the frontage of Mr. Thaddeus' shop 1 metre has been allowed.

J. CALCOTT GASKIN.

September 1, 1910.

Enclosure 39 in No. 26.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 781/43.)
Your Excellency, *Bagdad, September* 6, 1910.

IN continuation of my despatch No. 776/42 of yesterday's date, I have the honour to submit a copy of a letter from the Vali of Bagdad to my address, which was accidentally omitted from among the enclosures relating to the destruction of immovable property at Bagdad.

It will be seen that this letter, which is dated the 27th August, is a reply to one of mine written on the 28th of the preceding month. The long delay in replying will be noted, also the facts that the property in Mr. Parry's charge had been destroyed in the interim, and the matter in consequence brought to the notice of the Porte.

It is probably unnecessary for me to point out that, in the circumstances of the case, the opinions of the municipal committee and of their engineer are without value, and merely express the views that the vali, in whose hands they are puppets, would like to find acceptance.

His Excellency's action in writing to me at all, even after long delay, on a subject in regard to which he denied the right of a consular officer to intervene, seems inconsistent with his letter to me of the 2nd August, of which a copy has already been forwarded to your Excellency.

I have, &c.
J. G. LORIMER, I.C.S.,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

Enclosure 40 in No. 26.

The Vali of Bagdad to Consul-General Lorimer.

M. le Consul général, *Bagdad, le* 14 (27) *août*, 1910.

EN réponse à votre lettre du 28 juillet, j'ai l'honneur de vous informer que j'avais transmis les deux requêtes signées, l'une par Mr. Parry, et la seconde par M. Thaddeus, au président de la municipalité de Bagdad. Le conseil municipal, dûment réuni à cet effet, m'a répondu, par le canal de son président, que les deux bâtiments, qui font l'objet des requêtes en question, ont été considérés, par un rapport de l'ingénieur de la municipalité, comme présentant des indices d'écroulement et constituant un danger public.

Veuillez, &c.
Le Gouverneur général,
Commandant de la VI^e^ Armée,
H. NAZIM.

[37546] No. 27.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 17.)

(No. 727.)
Sir, *Constantinople, October* 12, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, reporting certain false allegations made by Hikmet Pasha, the commodore, regarding British action in the Persian Gulf.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 27.

Consul Crow to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 54.)
Sir, *Bussorah, September* 16, 1910.

I LEARN privately that Hikmet Pasha, the commodore, recently sent a report to the Minister of Marine to the effect that if he was not supplied with another gun-boat

and a transport-ship the English were likely to take Bussorah. About two weeks ago the vali received an urgent telegram on the subject, asking him to report the facts. The vali replied that he noticed no indications of such an intention on the part of the English, and that the report was unfounded; but, in any case, a gun-boat and a transport-ship would not prevent them.

Hikmet Pasha seems to have won the confidence of Nazim Pasha, the Vali of Bagdad, and is undoubtedly intriguing against Suleiman Nazif Bey, the Vali of Bussorah, with whom he is not at present on speaking terms. I understand their differences are partly due to questions relating to the provisioning of the naval barracks and the crew of the "Marmaris," and partly to an unjustifiable claim put forward by Hikmet Pasha for a sumptuary allowance of 15 liras a-month for the entertainment of foreigners, which sum he asked to be paid out of the vilayet revenue. The vali said he did not entertain, and was not entitled to the allowance.

The arrangements for paying the "fleet" seem somewhat imperfect, and the quarrel may have been embittered by the reported action of the captain of the gun-boat stationed near Ghermet Ali, above Bussorah, who is alleged to have invited the local mal mudiri to pay him an official visit on the national fête day and to have arrested him on board during the visit because he had not paid the captain's salary. The mal mudiri is said to have paid up, but complained to the vali that the captain had spoilt his fête day.

Hikmet Pasha seems to have decided anti-English proclivities, and is no doubt nettled by our unwillingness to assist him in his schemes for the improvement of the bar, reported in my despatches Nos. 37, 40, and 44, of the 22nd June and the 1st and 12th July respectively. His mendacious reports respecting British action in regard to Bussorah may be due to spite or to a desire to attract public attention. He seems ill qualified to occupy a position of importance.

I have, &c.
F. E. CROW.

[37548] No. 28.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(*Received October* 17.)

(No. 729.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 12, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith, for communication to the War Office, a despatch from the military attaché to this embassy, submitting observations on the interest taken by Germany in the efficiency of the IVth Ordu.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 28.

Major Tyrrell to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 60.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 10, 1910.

IN my No. 54 I reported that Germany was apparently taking an interest in the reorganisation of the Hamidieh cavalry regiments. As two questions of some interest and importance are raised in this connection—first, whether Germany is really concerned about the efficiency of the IVth Ordu, as being the first troops available in case of need on the Russian frontier; and secondly, how far the Turks are fulfilling, or have fulfilled, German wishes in this direction—I have the honour to submit the following remarks on this subject:

Sir Francis Elliot's statement, in a recent despatch from Athens, that the German Ambassador and military attaché here had been instructed to protest against any reduction of the Turkish forces towards the Russian frontier, would seem to leave no room for doubt that Germany does attach considerable importance to the IVth Ordu being brought to a state of efficiency and readiness.

That her representations are having some effect may be indicated by the movement reported by His Britannic Majesty's vice-consul at Mosul on the 29th September. He stated that orders had been received for all troops detached from the IVth Ordu to rejoin. In accordance with this order three Nizam battalions and a cavalry regiment

have left Mosul for Bitlis and Diarbekir. This is not a large or important move, and would ordinarily pass unnoticed politically), as it is natural enough that troops which are temporarily serving outside their own districts should eventually return there.

My German colleague, who is not given to asking questions, has lately been rather persistent in asking me whether any movements are reported in the IVth, VIth, and and VIIth Ordus, which looks as though he wished to assure himself that something was being done.

In the past fortnight the four battalions of the IInd Ordu which remained in the Yemen, have arrived in the Adrianople district.

The above indications, unimportant in themselves, tend collectively, in my opinion, to confirm Sir F. Elliot's statement, and to show that the Turks are beginning to act in the desired sense, and are bringing detached troops back to centres where their presence is strategically more desirable.

As regards the second question. In General von der Goltz's scheme for the reorganisation of the Turkish army with the help of German officers, the IVth Ordu was provided for as well as the first three, and three German officers duly proceeded to Erzinjan. Unfortunately we have no means of getting information from this place, and it is impossible to say what progress they are making there. From the news I get from other places, I am of opinion that up to now practically nothing has been done in the IVth Ordu, and that the troops are in much the same state of inefficiency as under the old régime. I have lately broached this question of the progress of the IVth Ordu, with Turkish officers, who all admit, with regret, that nothing has so far been done, and that all the best officers have been brought to the three European ordus. Further the cadres are very weak, which is not to be wondered at, for in addition to the absence of battalions on duty in Mesopotamia and the Yemen, there have been large drafts of Nizam soldiers to fill vacancies in the VIth Ordu as well as those in the European ones. This may be described as an illegitimate means of weakening the ordu, for it does not alter the paper strength, and so is not apparent, and it is probably to the continuance of similar drains on its strength that the Germans object. Turkish officers say frankly that they can afford to neglect the IVth Ordu at present. But I think that now it will be taken in hand.

In discussing this question generally with my Russian colleague, he agrees with me that up till now nothing has been done in the IVth Ordu, but that we may expect to see an improvement similar to the one, very considerable in all respects, which is apparent in the first three ordus.

As Erzinjan is the place from which reforms will be started, it is much to be hoped that we will have some means of getting news from there which will enable us to judge of the progress of the IVth Ordu.

I have, &c.
G. E. TYRRELL, *Major*,
Military Attaché.

[37790] No. 29.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(*Received October* 17.)

Sir, *India Office, October* 17, 1910.

WITH reference to previous correspondence regarding the registration of the Sheikh of Koweit's property at Fadaghia, I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to forward, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, copy of a telegram from the Government of India on the subject.

The suggestion made by the Government of India is one which at an earlier stage had commended itself to Viscount Morley (see my letter of the 11th August last). But the position has changed, and he finds nothing in this telegram to cause him to dissent from the terms of Sir E. Grey's draft despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, in which he intimated his concurrence in my letter of the 7th instant, unless it should appear that, with the removal of the Vali of Bussorah, the demand for registration as a Turkish subject has been dropped.

I have, &c.
R. RITCHIE.

Enclosure in No. 29.

Government of India to Viscount Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P. *October* 13, 1910.

SEE my telegram dated the 9th September regarding property of Sheikh of Koweit at Fadaghia.

Please see letter of the 25th ultimo from Resident, Persian Gulf, forwarded with letter of the 6th instant, from Secretary to Government of India, Foreign Department, for details as to the way in which in the past registration questions in connection with properties on Shat-el-Arab belonging to the sheikh were solved. Properties of sheikh are now, briefly stated, as follows:—

1. Estates at Fao and Farhaniya; these are not registered in Tapu office, they were acquired by inheritance.

2. Property at Mutawiah, which was purchased in 1907–8; this property was registered in the Tapu office partly in the names of three of the sheikh's women folk, and partly in the names of his four sons. In the case of the women, certificates of nationality were insisted upon, and were taken out in 1909. No certificates were taken out by the sons.

3. The property at Fadaghia, with which we are now concerned. Simplest solution would be, in resident's opinion, that property should be registered in the name of the same three ladies or in that of the blind son of the sheikh, though, in view of our attitude on the question of the status of Koweit, this might bear a somewhat inconvenient aspect. Resident suggests that, in order to maintain locally a consistent attitude, sheikh should be informed, in event of solution assuming the above lines, that we learn that a compromise on these lines commends itself to the Turkish Government, and that we do not propose to complicate matters by raising objections, seeing that sheikh's financial interests are so strongly concerned. Should the above solution be adopted, we agree in communication to sheikh suggested by resident, though we are not aware of the nature of the representations which have been made to the Porte by His Majesty's Government. As regards your telegram dated the 30th September, we have consulted the resident.

[37776] No. 30.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 17.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Consul-General Cox, dated the 15th October, 1910, relative to the Sheikh of Koweit's property at Fadaghia and the Turkish mudirs for Odeid.

India Office, October 17, 1910.

Enclosure in No. 30.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cox to Viscount Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P. *Bushire, October* 15, 1910.

SEE your telegram addressed to Bushire on the 12th or 13th instant.

1. I was to-day informed by Sheikh of Koweit that he sent his agent to Bussorah yesterday in order to pay the new vali the revenue of Fadaghia. The payment was not accepted by the vali, whose instructions were not to recognise the sheikh unless he registered his sons as Turkish subjects, and to treat Ahmad Pasha as owner of the property. The vali also said that the date crop would be taken if Ahmad Pasha did not pay revenue.

2. Report from political agent announces actual appointment as mudirs at Odeid under Abu Thabi and Zobara, opposite Bahrein, of officials resident at Hofhuf, but neither has yet joined appointment so far as political agent can make out without personal visit.

(Repeated to Government of India.)

[37778] No. 31.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 17.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 15th October, 1910, relative to Odeid.

India Office, October 17, 1910.

Enclosure in No. 31.

Government of India to Viscount Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P. *India Office, October* 15, 1910.

SEE your telegram dated the 12th October, to which a reply has been sent direct by Resident, Persian Gulf, respecting Odeid. Please refer to letter, dated the 20th ultimo, from India Office to Foreign Office.

We would invite reference to explicit assurance by Turkish Government, forwarded with letter addressed to the Foreign Office on the 19th January, 1872, by embassy at Constantinople, that no design of obtaining any supremacy over independent tribes along Persian Gulf littoral was entertained by them.

[32854] No. 32.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 312.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, October* 17, 1910.

I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 603 of the 22nd August and other reports, in which you enumerate repeated instances of the arbitrary and vexatious treatment of British subjects in Asiatic Turkey, and, further, draw my attention to the number of incidents of political aggression, all tending to a disturbance of the *status quo*, which have recently marked the conduct of the Ottoman authorities in the region of the Persian Gulf.

It will be convenient to deal first with the injustice to which British commercial interests have been subjected.

In July the representative of Messrs. Lynch and Co. at Bagdad was informed that certain property of his firm would, under a municipal regulation, be demolished as insecure and dangerous. The British Consul-General found that the property, which he took an early opportunity of inspecting, was perfectly safe.

A few days later a notification was made to Messrs. Abdul Ali, a British-Indian firm, respecting the projected demolition, on similar grounds, of their principal shop and the arbitrary expropriation of the site, which is a valuable one. This property was likewise found, on inspection, to be in excellent condition and in no wise dangerous.

The British Consul-General hereupon visited the President of the Municipality and protested vigorously against the wanton destruction of property on a false pretext of danger to the public. The conclusion drawn by His Majesty's Consul-General was that, in the absence of funds to meet the cost of legal expropriation, the procedure complained of had been adopted.

Notwithstanding that your Excellency had in the meantime made urgent representations through the Minister of the Interior, an extensive demolition of Messrs. Lynch's property, including their chief office, was begun on the 7th August, and more recently His Majesty's Consul-General has reported that the property of British subjects already demolished and threatened means a loss of some £T. 5,000; while he learns that it is proposed to enforce further expropriations, at great loss to many British subjects resident in Bagdad.

On the 29th September your Excellency reported that British-Indian property at Kazimia and Kerbela had likewise been demolished, and that the Vali had declined any indemnification on grounds which are wholly unconvincing.

His Majesty's Government must emphatically protest against this procedure; they must further, in view of the fact that it has originated with the Vali, hold the Ottoman

Government themselves responsible for the damage already inflicted, and, after receiving a report as to its precise extent from His Majesty's Consul-General, your Excellency should present a detailed claim to the Ottoman Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Before leaving the question of these expropriations, I think it necessary to advert to the rumoured intention of the Vali of Bagdad to cause a new road to be constructed through the middle of the grounds of His Majesty's Consulate-General, whereas by making a slight deviation it might be made to follow an existing road: it is true that after your Excellency had made representations to the Sublime Porte, the Vali asserted to His Majesty's Consul-General that no interference with the Consulate buildings had been in contemplation: I feel constrained to observe that the local evidence to the contrary effect is of a conclusive character.

Two further cases of unwarrantable interference with British interests have also recently occurred at Bagdad:—

In the first of these cases Messrs. Abdul Ali, the British-Indian firm already referred to, were suddenly ordered to sell the ice manufactured by them at a reduced rate of 10 paras a kilogramme instead of 20 paras an oke, their usual charge: I understand that owing to non-compliance with this arbitrary order the local authorities have threatened to close by force two ice factories belonging to British Indian subjects.

In the second case two British firms, Messrs. Blockey Cree and Co. and Messrs. Blaney and Solomon, were informed that they must transfer their factories to the outskirts of the town, on the pretext of a regulation 46 years old concerning steam-engines and boilers, whereas, as your Excellency has pointed out to me, the factories in question are run by smokeless oil-engines, which are in no respect dangerous. There is clearly, therefore, no ground whatever for the application of the regulation to these factories, and its enforcement would be wholly unreasonable and very burdensome to the owners.

Your Excellency should insist upon satisfaction being accorded to all these British subjects and afford to them the full and effectual protection of His Majesty's Government, who cannot admit a continuance of the oppression to which they are being subjected. You should add that His Majesty's Government cannot be expected to acquiesce in the helplessness expressed by the Ottoman Minister for Foreign Affairs with regard to the illegal proceedings of the Bagdad authorities, and that such helplessness on the part of the central authorities amounts to an abdication of Government.

I have already furnished your Excellency with full instructions on the subject of the forcible and unjust intervention of the Ministry of Public Works in the dispute which has arisen between the Smyrna–Aidin Railway Company and the Société des Quais: it is matter for grave concern to His Majesty's Government that, apart from this particular incident, the Board of this Company should be compelled to complain that "for the past two years the attitude of the Ministry of Commerce and Public Works has been increasingly overbearing and harassing," and that they should have claimed the active protection of His Majesty's Government "not only on account of the important material interests involved in the present case, but also in view of the systematic and continuous attempts which are now being made to encroach on the Company's rights and privileges as laid down in its Conventions with the Imperial Ottoman Government."

I pass now to the incidents of political aggression.

On the 30th May, 1909, I informed your Excellency that the Turks had some time previously occupied the island of Zakhumiyeh, which lies some 10 miles south-east of Ujair; that they had hoisted the Turkish flag on a fort, and had arranged to keep a guard there; that the Sheikh of Bahrein had protested to His Majesty's Government against this occupation, his father having built the fort, where he used to keep a garrison, fifty years ago; and that the island, which had no permanent inhabitants, had been regularly visited for purposes of fishing, by natives of Bahrein.

I do not propose to enter upon a detailed review of British relations with the Sheikh of Bahrein and the Trucial Chiefs, since the matter is one which in no wise concerns the Ottoman Government: I need simply observe that those relations have been the foundation of the maritime peace which has now been maintained in the Persian Gulf for well-nigh a century.

Moreover, as your Excellency is aware, in November and December 1871 the Ottoman Minister for Foreign Affairs himself gave assurances that his Government had no intention of attacking or obtaining any supremacy over Bahrein or the independent tribes on the coast of the Persian Gulf, and similar assurances had already repeatedly been given to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople.

But apart altogether from the assurances of the Ottoman Government to which

I have referred, Ujair, in the district of El Katif, is the most southerly point which His Majesty's Government have ever recognised as being under Turkish influence on the coast of the Persian Gulf.

In these circumstances your Excellency was instructed to request the Ottoman Government to withdraw the garrison from Zakhumiyeh on the ground of terminating a disturbance of the *status quo*; and your representations were to be based not only on the title of the Sheikh of Bahrein to the island, but also on the fact that it is situated some distance to the south-east of Ujair, the furthest limit of Ottoman jurisdiction.

Although the Ottoman Minister for Foreign Affairs informed your Excellency that the garrison had been withdrawn in June 1909, it has since been reinstated in the island, and, according to the latest reports, has quite recently been reinforced: and the Ottoman authorities in regard to this question seem set upon disregarding your Excellency's repeated representations on the subject.

I have accordingly to instruct your Excellency to request that orders may be issued for the immediate and permanent withdrawal of the garrison.

The next point upon which I desire to address your Excellency is the treatment to which the Sheikh of Koweit has been subjected by Suleiman Nazif Bey, the late Vali of Bussorah, with regard to the property which he purchased, in the course of last year, from Ahmed Pasha-el-Zoheir at a price of £T. 48,000 which was duly paid down. When, however, Sheikh Mubarek took steps to register the transfer at the Turkish Land Office he was informed that he must register himself as a Turkish subject: such a demand in reference to a transfer of land had never before been made.

Your Excellency should inform the Minister for Foreign Affairs that His Majesty's Government regard the conduct of the late Vali in this matter as an attempt to modify the *status quo* with regard to Koweit, which is the basis of the understanding between His Majesty's Government and the Ottoman Government in this important question.

It appears, moreover, from reliable and circumstantial reports, that the late Vali tried by tortuous methods to instigate the vendor of the Fedaghia property to impugn Sheikh Mubarek's title. The vendor remonstrated with the Vali, pointing out the absurdity of repudiating the sale in the face of the title-deeds held by the Sheikh, which, besides the signature of the vendor, bore those of all the Bussorah notables as well as that of the British consul.

His Majesty's Government rely upon the Ottoman Government to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the registration of this property; they have no wish to raise difficulties with regard to the past conduct of an official who has since been recalled; but I must add that the incident is vexatious, and serves to deepen the impression entertained by His Majesty's Government of ill-will on the part of the Turkish officials.

In his recent dealings with the Sheikh of Mohammerah the conduct of the late Vali of Bussorah has been in the highest degree violent, vindictive, and unjust.

It is known to His Majesty's Government from reports received from His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah that there were no disturbances of importance on the Shat-el-Arab during last winter, that the Sheikh recently exercised his good offices in the endeavour to promote a reconciliation between the Vali and an important Arab chief of Turkish nationality, and that the Sheikh has, in fact, carried his conciliatory attitude towards Nazif Bey so far as to acquiesce without complaint in the destruction of houses belonging to him at Bussorah. It is further known through His Majesty's Consul at Mohammerah that Sheikh Khazal has endeavoured to promote friendly relations between Nazif Bey and the Vali of Pusht-i-Kuh.

Such was the situation at the end of March last when the Sheikh and the Vali appeared still to be on the best of terms. Shortly afterwards, however, the Vali brought against the Sheikh certain accusations into the nature of which it is unnecessary to enter in detail, since your Excellency is already familiar with it from the correspondence which has passed on the subject. No serious proof of the truth of these accusations was ever offered, nor was any opportunity ever given to the Sheikh to disprove the charges brought against him, which he was perfectly able and willing to do. On the contrary, the Vali totally ignored a friendly and conciliatory letter addressed to him by the Sheikh, expressing the intention of proceeding to Bussorah to discuss the matters in dispute, and, further, on the Sheikh's arrival there on the 18th April, most unjustifiably and discourteously refused to receive him at all.

The Sheikh had no alternative but to return to Mohammerah. On the 24th April the Vali issued circular instructions to the local officials under his jurisdiction

summarily to remove all headmen dependent on the Sheikh, and on the 25th April, during the latter's absence at Ahwaz, the Turkish gun-boat "Marmaris," acting on the orders of Nazif Bey, shelled the village of Zain belonging to the Sheikh, which was afterwards looted and destroyed by Turkish soldiers. In the course of this attack the house of the Sheikh's mother was burnt, and one of his wives died from shock caused by the bombardment.

On the 26th April the Vali, in two official letters addressed to the Persian Consul at Bussorah, went so far as to threaten action against Mohammerah itself in the event of failure to comply with his demands.

In spite of the injury and provocation which he had received, Sheikh Khazal continued to be guided by the advice of His Majesty's Government by maintaining a conciliatory attitude, by restraining his agents and supporters from any aggressive action, and by adopting their suggestions with respect to the wording of his communications with the Vali. The latter, on the contrary, displayed strong resentment at the attempts made by His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah, under instructions from His Majesty's Government, to promote an understanding between him and the Sheikh.

Nazif Bey, it is true, finally accepted Sheikh Khazal's explanations and agreed to consider the incident closed, but he unconditionally refused to express regret for the death of the Sheikh's wife and the destruction of his mother's house, or to pay any compensation for the losses suffered by the Sheikh in consequence of the unjustifiable bombardment of Zain. Further, at the very moment when he was considering the Sheikh's explanations with which he owned himself satisfied, his agents were occupied in subjecting the Sheikh to further petty annoyances in the matter of the renewal, contrary to the Vali's promise, of the lawsuit against the servant of Mirza Hamza, the Sheikh's agent at Bussorah, of the unjustified destruction, for the third time since the dispute between the Sheikh and the Vali began, of the former's house property on the Ashar Creek and of the raid on Mirza Hamza's house and the seizure of his property, on the ground that he had disregarded a summons for debt which had been issued against him. There can be little doubt that Nazif Bey was the real instigator of these vexatious proceedings.

A further injustice to the Sheikh has now been committed by the decree recently issued by the Sublime Porte forbidding the registration of land in the vilayet of Bussorah in the name of the Sheikh or his representatives, a measure which appears to be actually contrary to Ottoman law.

Your Excellency should bring these facts to the notice of the Turkish Government, and inform them that His Majesty's Government are bound, by agreement with the Sheikh, to use their good offices on his behalf in the event of a dispute with a foreign Power, that they have most carefully considered the circumstances of his recent dispute with the Vali of Bussorah, and can see no justification whatever for the harsh and aggressive action of the latter, especially in the matter of the attack on Zain, nor for the recent decree of the Porte regarding the registration of land in the vilayet of Bussorah. You should add that, in view of their obligations towards the Sheikh, they cannot allow the *status quo* on the Shat-el-Arab to be altered to his detriment, and you should express the hope that a satisfactory arrangement will be arrived at with the Sheikh, who has displayed anxiety to live on good terms with his neighbours, and has shown, throughout recent events, great self-restraint and patience, in marked contrast—as His Majesty's Government observe with regret—with the attitude of the Turkish authorities.

These occurrences, which individually have been the cause of painful surprise to His Majesty's Government, have produced, in their cumulative effect, an unfavourable impression as to the present attitude of the local Ottoman authorities,—an attitude which appears to be one of hostility and aggression.

His Majesty's Government cannot believe that this attitude has the approval of the Central Government, or is based upon their specific instructions. I therefore have decided to instruct you to communicate a translation of this despatch to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, in order that his Excellency may be fully apprised of the views of His Majesty's Government and of their causes of complaint: in taking this step your Excellency should explain that His Majesty's Government have decided to make friendly representations, believing that the Ottoman Government will redress the grievances referred to, for a situation of very considerable gravity would of course arise if they proved to be the result of deliberate and unfriendly policy.

I am, &c.
E. GREY.

[37935] No. 33.

Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to Foreign Office.—(Received October 18.)

3, Salter's Hall Court, Cannon Street, London.
October 13, 1910.

Sir,

MY board have had under consideration the present state of affairs in connection with the navigation of the Euphrates and Tigris. They regard the situation with great anxiety. A native steamer service on the Euphrates was commenced in May 1909; and between that time and the 6th August, 1910, twenty-seven round trips have been accomplished and upwards of 4,000 tons of cargo carried. On the Tigris above Bagdad a permit of navigation has been granted by the Turkish Government to a native firm, who have commenced a service with a stern-wheel steamer called the "Dijleh." Between Bagdad and Bussorah a similar permit has recently been granted to another native to run two steamers. We understand that foreigners are not precluded from joining in these enterprises; but we are informed on the authority of the Minister for Public Works in Constantinople that care will be taken to secure that we shall not participate in them.

By my letters of the 3rd June and 20th July, 1910, to which I have not yet had the honour of a reply, I have already communicated with you on the subject generally of the present letter. My board are still prepared to send a tug and barge up the Euphrates with a view to establishing a regular service, and would like to know that His Majesty's Government acquiesce in this.

We have received communication of a letter addressed by you to Mr. H. F. B. Lynch on the 28th July, and of his reply of the 30th July, on the subject of the recent abortive negotiations for the fusion of the navigation interests on the rivers of Mesopotamia. We understand that the matter was discussed on the 20th ultimo with Lord Hardinge by Colonel Picot, and that it is not denied that pressure was brought to bear upon this company by the Foreign Office with a view to our obtaining control over the Turkish service in order to stave off similar action on the part of the German interests. We were informed that if we held back others would receive the support of the Foreign Office in taking our place. It was in response to this pressure and at the express instance of the Foreign Office that negotiations were commenced for the acquisition of the Turkish line. It is quite true that the form of the acquisition did not emanate from the Foreign Office. It emanated from the Turkish Government, who refused to give us control over their service unless we formed an Ottoman company into which the British and the Turkish services should be fused. Their proposal was carefully considered by His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, and was referred by Colonel Picot personally to Sir Charles Hardinge in the spring of 1909. It required consideration, as it involved the disappearance of the British flag. It was decided on behalf of His Majesty's Government to support the proposal, provided that we obtain control of the combined companies. I am to add that the transference to the combined enterprise of the exclusive rights of the Turkish company has always formed an integral part of our scheme. Indeed, such transference was the only way in which we, or any other parties, could effect the object of the Foreign Office, namely, to prevent a disturbance of the *status quo* on the river by the advent of German interests.

My board consider it the more necessary to invite your attention to the origin of the negotiations, inasmuch as it serves to throw light upon the existing situation. If German interests acquire control of the Turkish Government steamers the concern with its exclusive rights will pass to them, barring the way to an extension of our operations to meet the increased competition. If, on the other hand, we were to acquire control of the concern without the exclusive rights, German interests would certainly claim permission to form an Ottoman company on the rivers, and the object which the Foreign Office had in view would be defeated. It seems important that this should be clearly realised.

There seems to be no present likelihood of the Turkish Government giving us control of their line with or without a fusion with our own company unless His Majesty's Government are prepared to hold them to the pledges and promises given in connection with the recent negotiations. Failing this, the next best course would be to require that the restrictions at present imposed upon the operations of our existing British company should be removed. Our proposal to initiate a service on the Euphrates at once would be a first step in this direction, or, alternatively, it might serve to pave the way for the formation of a new Ottoman company. This last course would take the

form of an application to the Turkish Government for a permit to form an Ottoman company distinct from our own company, to ply on the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers with their tributaries. Should this course find favour with His Majesty's Government, my board would point out that the application should be made with the least possible delay, in order to avoid opposition from other interests which are in process of being created.

We are quite prepared to form such at Ottoman company, but it is obvious that the Turkish Government would not even consider our application in view of the rebuffs to which we have recently been obliged to submit at their hands. If, therefore, this be the course favoured by His Majesty's Government, my board would request that an intimation may be conveyed to the Turkish Government by His Majesty's Government, which would render probable their compliance with the application.

In conclusion, my board feel that the labour bestowed by them during the last two years in connection with the negotiations with the Turkish Government, their readiness to make concessions in order not to prejudice the success of these negotiations, and the expense to which this company has been put, entitle them to the strong support of His Majesty's Government in finding an issue out of a situation which is one of grave menace to long-established British interests. The cost of the negotiations has amounted to the considerable sum of 3,677*l.* 9*s.* 3*d.*, the details of which I enclose herewith.*

I have, &c.
H. W. MACLEAN, *Secretary.*

[37813] No. 34.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(*Received October* 18.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 6th October, relative to a suggested treaty with the Katr Sheikh.

India Office, October 17, 1910.

Enclosure in No. 34.

Viscount Morley to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P. *India Office, October* 6, 1910.

PLEASE see despatch dated the 22nd August from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, forwarded with letter dated the 16th ultimo from Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department.

I should be glad to learn your opinion as to concluding a treaty with the Sheikh of El Katr.

[37962] No. 35.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(*Received October* 18.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the resident in the Persian Gulf, dated the 17th October, 1910, regarding the reported revival of the Mudirate at Zubara.

India Office, October 18, 1910.

---

* Not printed.

Enclosure in No. 35.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cox to Viscount Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P. *Bushire, October* 17, 1910.

SEE my telegram of the 14th instant, and telegram of same date from Major Birdwood.

Revival of Zubara Mudirate was also reported, in separate connection, by political agent, Behrein. Wakra and Zubara appointments were rescinded in 1903 as a result of protest to Turkish Government, and their simultaneous revival is natural.

(Repeated to Government of India.)

[37833] No. 36.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(*Received October* 18.)

(No. 225.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, October* 17, 1910.

ZAKHUNIYEH.

Please see my telegram No. 206 of the 28th ultimo.

I was informed to-day by Rifaat Pasha that the Vali of Bussorah had been instructed not to allow gendarmes unless authorised by Government here to return to Zakhuniyeh after they had left at the end of the fishing season, which should be about now.

This arrangement, which implies a return to the *status quo*, has been made in order that the prestige of the Central Government may not be lowered in the eyes of the Arabs and local authorities. Occupation from any other quarter is, his Excellency assured me, out of the question.

[32854] No. 37.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 314.)
Sir, *Foreign Office, October* 18, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 312 of the 17th instant, I have to request your Excellency to instruct His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad to draw up, in consultation with the agents of the several firms concerned, a detailed valuation of the damage recently inflicted upon British subjects at Bagdad, Kerbela, Kazimia, and any other places within his district in consequence of the demolition of property and the expropriation of lands.

On receipt of this valuation, which should be prepared with all reasonable expedition, your Excellency should present a claim for the total sum involved to the Ottoman Minister for Foreign Affairs, and press for early payment by the central Government.

I am, &c.
E. GREY.

[38125] No. 38.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(*Received October* 20.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of enclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 29th September, 1910, relative to the American Missionary Dispensary at Mutra.

India Office, October 19, 1910.

Enclosure 1 in No. 38.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cox to Government of India.

(Confidential.) *Bushire, September* 11, 1910.

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with foreign department endorsement dated the 9th May, 1910, I have the honour to forward for the information of the Government of India a copy of a letter received from the political agent, Muscat, on the subject of the American Missionary Dispensary at Mutra.

2. It will be seen that with a change of personnel his Highness the Sultan seems disposed to change his attitude, which was no doubt due in a large measure to the tactless management of the question by Dr. Thoms and the Rev. Mr. Barney in the first instance.

Enclosure 2 in No. 38.

Major Trevor to Lieutenant-Colonel Cox.

(Confidential.) *Muscat, September* 3, 1910.

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with your office endorsement dated the 22nd May, 1910, regarding the American Missionary Dispensary at Mutra, I have the honour to inform you that Dr. A. K. Bennett, who was recently at Koweit, arrived in Muscat towards the end of last month, and has since taken up his residence at Mutra where he is practising medicine and carrying on the dispensary.

2. I am informed that Dr. Bennett will probably only stay till the autumn, when he will be relieved by another doctor coming from America, whether this will be Dr. Thoms returning from leave or another doctor I do not know.

3. The mission are still on the look out for a house in Mutra for a hospital, and there is some talk of purchasing a house belonging to the estate of the late Mr. Mackirdy. The house is, however, right in the town, small and unsuitable in every way, so probably the mission will not buy it.

4. The mission is expanding its scope at Muscat, and two lady missionaries are to come out in the autumn, one of whom will in all probability be a lady doctor.

5. His Highness the Sultan made no opposition to Dr. Bennett going to Mutra, and I think his objections to the mission working at Mutra are much less acute now that the Rev. Dr. Cantine, who has been well known to him for many years, has resumed charge of the mission.

[37962] No. 39.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 317.)
(Telegraphic.) R. *Foreign Office, October* 21, 1910.

IT is reported that mudirs have been appointed at Zobara and Wakra, though we have not yet heard of their departure for these posts.

Your Excellency should bring this to the notice of the Minister for Foreign Affairs and explain that such appointments constitute disturbance of the *status quo*, and add that His Majesty's Government must protest against the appointment of any Turkish mudirs to reside in the El Katr Peninsula, which is outside Turkish jurisdiction.

[38519] No. 40.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 24.)

(No. 732.)
Sir, *Constantinople, October* 14, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, describing the arrangements made by the Vali of Bussorah and the Sheikh of Mohammerah for the prevention of river piracy.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 40.

Consul Crow to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 53.)
Sir, *Bussorah, September* 15, 1910.

THE vali has made practical and satisfactory arrangements, in concert with Sheikh Khazal of Mohammerah, for the protection of the river during the date season.

On the 3rd September the vali visited Fao with Sheikh Khazal, and afterwards returned as his guest to Failiya, where he passed the night. The river from Fao to Bussorah is to be patrolled day and night by three Persian boats on the Persian side, with a mixed complement of Turkish and Persian guards on board, and by three Turkish boats on the Turkish side, manned by Persian and Turkish guards. Ahmed Pasha Zoheir presented one boat to the Turkish authorities for the purpose, and the other two are in course of preparation.

This arrangement is eminently satisfactory from the Turkish point of view, and is, so I understand from Lieutenant Wilson, heartily approved of by the Sheikh of Mohammerah. If effectively carried out I do not anticipate further trouble from river piracy.

Although we have had no piratical attacks in the river this year, a bad case of piracy was reported to me at the end of August, as having occurred recently between Koweit and Fao, at a place named Shaybiyah. A sailing vessel proceeding from Koweit to Bussorah, containing thirteen persons, a cargo of ghee and coffee, and 3,000 rupees in cash, was looted by pirates, who killed two of the crew and threw the others overboard with stones round their necks. Two of the gang were subsequently caught selling some tins of the stolen ghee at Koweit, and were arrested by the Sheikh Mubarek. Where they came from or who they were has not yet transpired. No complaint was addressed to this consulate on the subject.

I have, &c.
F. E. CROW.

[38520] No. 41.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 24.)

(No. 733.)
Sir, *Constantinople October* 14, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 732 of to-day's date, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, concerning the recall of Suleiman Nazif Bey, Vali of Bussorah, and commenting on his administration in the past.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 41.

Consul Crow to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 55.)
Sir, *Bussorah, September* 17, 1910.

WITH reference to your Excellency's telegram of the 14th instant, I have the honour to report that Suleiman Nazif Bey received a telegram yesterday from the Minister of the Interior recalling him immediately to Constantinople, and leaves by mail to-day, having placed the cadi in charge of the vilayet pending the arrival of Djelal Bey, Mutessarif of Kerbela.

The vali's departure is much to be regretted. He has only been here ten months, and during that time has done much to improve the condition of things in and around Bussorah, and to suppress lawlessness. His energy and his strenuous efforts for reform have not, however, elicited a very sympathetic response or roused much enthusiasm among a conservative and retrograde population; and the official element, on which he has had to rely for co-operation, is of the most uneducated and inferior kind. He has made many enemies, notably the Nakib faction and their partisans, whose interest is not in the direction of reform. In spite of this he has preserved order in the town and on the river in a manner unprecedented in my experience of Bussorah. The

gendarmerie, which has much improved, and now presents a respectable appearance, is drilled daily. New guard-houses have been erected, and a systematic patrol organised in Bussorah and the Ashar suburb. Nightly disturbances and armed marauding seem to have been completely checked. No robberies or armed attacks of a serious nature have been reported to me since the vali's arrival. He frequently inspects the guard stations personally at night, and any remissness on the part of police or gendarmes has been severely punished. His road-making met with much local opposition, and the scanty funds at his disposal did not enable him to give adequate compensation to all persons whose property he destroyed. But he succeeded in widening and straightening the main road from Ashar to Bussorah, and in clearing space for the purpose right through the bazar and up to the Serai, which is incontestably a public benefit and an excellent thing for the town. The work is still far from complete, but the outlines of a good thoroughfare are now visible.

The vali's relations with the Sheikh of Mohammerah have already been reported, and my views on this subject submitted to your Excellency. It is noticeable that since the Zein incident there has been no interference from that quarter in the affairs of the vilayet, and no river disturbance of any kind. Shortly before giving up office the vali made satisfactory arrangements in concert with the sheikh for patrolling the river, as reported in my despatch No. 53 of the 15th instant; but I regret to say that a telegram to-day from Hikmet Pasha, the commodore, now at Bagdad, who is acting apparently under the instructions of Nazim Pasha, cancels these arrangements. I have already adverted to the enmity between the vali and the commodore, and the latter has lost no time in availing himself of Suleiman Nazif Bey's removal to upset what promised to become a very efficacious system of river control. It remains to be seen if the commodore will devise some alternative scheme himself.

In my personal intercourse with the vali I have always found him perfectly straightforward and loyal, and he has shown himself considerate and willing to help where foreign interests were concerned, provided they did not clash with what he believed to be the interests of the Turkish Government. Being of an impetuous and independent disposition, he brooked no restraint or interference, and his relations with Nazim Pasha suffered in consequence. His somewhat arbitrary and hasty decisions exposed him on several occasions to adverse criticism, and I think he made a mistake in wholly disregarding Arab prejudices and susceptibilities, and in seeking to crush them arbitrarily instead of attempting to soften them down. His mistakes were, however, I think, due to lack of experience in administrative affairs, as this was his first governorship. He is certainly a conscientious, if somewhat truculent, supporter of the new régime, and we lose in him a good governor and—what I regret most—a strong and honest man.

I have, &c.
F. E. CROW.

[38522] No. 42.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 24.)

(No. 735.)
Sir,

Constantinople, October 16, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 425 of the 28th June last, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's vice-consul at Van, reporting on the doings of the kaimakams in charge of the expedition against the Goyan and other Kurds, and on the consequent failure of the expedition.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 42.

Vice-Consul Molyneux-Seel to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 22.)
Sir,

Van, September 28, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to submit to your Excellency an account of the doings of the expedition sent against the Goyan and other Kurd tribes in June last.

As reported in my despatch No. 15, this expedition was confided to the joint charge of three civil kaimakams, viz., the kaimakam of Shattakh, an Armenian, the kaimakam of Julamerk, an Arab, and the kaimakam of Awrokh, a Kurd, and its objects were to cause the restitution of cattle, &c., plundered by these tribes from certain Christian villages, to arrest certain Kurds convicted by the tribunals, to verify the cattle registers, and generally to demonstrate to these unruly tribes that the days of law and order had come with the new régime.

The Kurds, on hearing of the approach of the troops, fled into the mountains, but eventually an encounter took place in which a Kurd agha and about twenty Kurds were killed.

A few days after this a difference arose between the kaimakam of Shattakh and the other two kaimakams, on account (it is said) of the former refusing to sign a falsified document regarding the amount of ammunition that had been expended, the said document being necessary to cover the sales of ammunition which had been made by his colleagues to the very Kurds against whom they had been fighting. After this the kaimakam of Shattakh returned to Shattakh. The vali, hearing of this, was very angry, and caused the dismissal of the kaimakam from his post. The universal opinion here is that this official was a capable and conscientious man hard to replace, and the vali is greatly blamed for causing his dismissal.

After the departure of the kaimakam, the remaining two set themselves to the task of counting the sheep and verifying the registers. A number of sheep in excess of those registered were found, whereupon the kaimakams pocketed large sums in bribes from the Kurds in lieu of extra taxation.

This business being finished, it was decided to attack the Kurds of Jeriki. A fight took place, but apparently was not successful. It so happened that at this time the Tyari had a quarrel with the Jeriki, so, profiting by the occasion, the two kaimakams invited the Tyari to attack the Jeriki. This they did, and succeeded in capturing a dozen of them, but by the time the soldiers had arrived to take over the prisoners, the Tyari had made up their difference with the Jeriki and released their captives.

Meanwhile the commandant of the troops had died of sickness, and it was decided to consider the expedition as finished. The battalion from Van arrived back here on the 21st September.

The net results of the expedition is practically nil. Not one of the desired objects has been attained. Doubtless a certain amount of fear for the troops has been instilled into at least one of the Kurd tribes, but in a manner which will hardly aid them in the understanding of the true meaning of a constitutional Government.

I have, &c.
L. MOLYNEUX-SEEL, *Captain.*

[38526] No. 43.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 24.)

(No. 739.)
Sir,

Constantinople, October 16, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 735 of the 14th instant, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, containing translation of a telegram sent by the Vali of Bussorah to Nazim Pasha, Vali of Bagdad, giving the reasons for his resignation.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 43.

Consul Crow to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 56.)
Sir,

Bussorah, September 20, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 55 of the 17th instant, I have the honour to transmit translation of a telegram addressed on the day of his departure by Suleyman Nazif Bey, Vali of Bussorah, to Nazim Pasha, Vali of Bagdad.

The vali's resignation is a fitting tribute to the anomalous system lately inaugurated of subordinating the Vali of Bussorah to the dictates and caprice of the commandant of the VIth Army Corps at Bagdad. Without going into the merits of the quarrel, it

would seem obvious that the governors of two independent vilayets should be themselves independent, and the attempt to serve two masters would appear to be as futile in Mesopotamia as elsewhere. Good government here is, I think, quite impossible under such conditions, and the experiment in the present instance has cost us dearly.

I have, &c.
F. E. CROW.

Enclosure 2 in No. 43.

The Vali of Bussorah to the Vali of Bagdad.

(Translation.)
(Telegraphic.)

Bussorah, September 4 (17), 1910.

THE marine department was requested to give the gendarme department an old steam launch for the protection of the Shatt-el-Arab from Fao to Bussorah during the date season, and the necessary steps were being taken, when the gendarme department was informed that the naval commandant, Hikmet Bey, now at Bagdad, had prevented his agent at Bussorah from complying with the request. As Hikmet Bey has raised difficulties for the vilayet in every matter for the last four months, such a proceeding on his part does not surprise me. The matter, however, does not concern me personally, but the property and administration of the State. The main point which causes me surprise and regret is that, for some reason or other, your Excellency should be attracted to Hikmet Bey and people like him, and adopt a policy which merely embarrasses my administration. As I am aware that such a causeless and unjust dissension is a misfortune for this weak and afflicted province, which cannot support serious disagreements, I have, after three requests and as many refusals, managed to get my resignation accepted by my department, the Ministry of the Interior. In truth I entertained great respect for your Excellency, and, looking as I did on your appointment as the joyful promise of civilisation for this region, I heartily appreciated it. But I am sorry to say I cannot reconcile myself to your Excellency's methods of government, which very much resemble those of the old régime, namely, your attaching greater importance to hypocritical methods than to the unbiassed warnings of patriotic citizens, and thus embarrassing alike every official, both high and low, in the exercise of his functions, and prejudicing the real needs and advancement of the country. I have resigned my post in order that the difference of opinion between us may not prove a further calamity for this vilayet. But though I have resigned the Governorship of Bussorah, my quality as an Ottoman citizen and my duties as a patriot remain. Here I am on firm ground, and it is in this character and by this authority that I appeal to you not to let a handful of inferior men confuse and spoil my unprejudiced views, and render more difficult the task of governing the country. On certain specific points and questions I could justify my opposition, but to cut the matter short I say no more, and beg you to believe that I pray for and sincerely wish you the complete and speedy success in your administration which you desire.

No. 44.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 24.)

(No. 745.)
Sir,

Constantinople, October 18, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 689 of the 27th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith two further despatches from His Majesty's consul at Damascus, reporting on the development of affairs in the Hauran and the measures of General Sami Pasha for the pacification of the Druze country.

Since the date of these despatches, the troops under Sami Pasha have made further progress, occupying two villages, Shuba and Shuke, to the north of Suweida. Mr. Devey reports that the Druzes have retreated into the Lijah country, north of the Hauran, but that they are at the same time handing in their arms and are likely to make no further resistance.

If the example of the Albanian campaign is followed, the next step for the troops will be to over-run the country with the idea of disarming and settling the population.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 44.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 46.)
Sir,

Damascus, September 30, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to report further on the state of affairs in the Jebel Druze, where the forces assembled at Deraa amount to thirty-one battalions, about 18,000 strong.

About twelve days ago the first battalion was ordered to advance from Deraa on Bosra-Eski-Sham, and thence to Salkhad. And at that time Yahia Bey Atrash was in the mountain above Tel-el-Ahmar, near the springs of the Suweida River, and there was talk of making night attacks upon the Government troops so soon as they should move, while a letter from the Kaimakam of Ahiré sent to call him to surrender was publicly read, as it were, in open defiance, at the big village shahba, where the Druzes usually assemble to open any business of importance. Saad-eddin Abu-Suleiman, the party concerned in the Unkhel affair, had also fled into the Lijah to escape arrest. However, Yahia Bey seems to have changed his mind, for on the 21st instant he went direct to Sami Pasha at Deraa to confer with him, and it was universally believed this was arranged through the intervention of a Greek Catholic Bishop named Cadi, of Khubab village, and that Yahia would be left free to withdraw after the interview. Sami Pasha, however, received him very distantly and coldly, and paid small attention to his remarks, but when he rose to leave he was informed that he was under arrest, and must stay at Deraa till he should be tried by court-martial; five other Druze sheikhs were arrested with him; the chief mustantik of the Damascus courts went to Deraa three days ago, presumably to formulate the accusations that are to be laid against Yahia Bey, and prepare the dossiers, while I believe an elderly Liva named Tewfik Pasha had been selected, after some difficulty in finding a suitable experienced officer, to preside at the court-martial, and is coming or perhaps may have arrived from Aleppo.

Local authorities profess to be satisfied at the state of affairs, and the Bishop Cadi now asserts, evidently at their behest, that he was present at the interview by mere chance and without any preconcerted arrangement. Public opinion regards the arrest as mean and ungenerous, and deduces that the old system of chicane and deception are still being practised under the constitution as in the days of Abdul Hamid; loyal and frank procedure would have produced a favourable attitude among the other Druzes, who are now saying that as when their sheikhs go to visit Turkish authorities they may be seized they had better revolt openly. However, the Government were satisfied and much pleased at a reply from Salkhad, signed by the Atrashes, Mustafa, Salame, and Hussein Mohammad and by another notable, addressed to Sami Pasha, saying the writers welcome the constitution with open arms.

I was at Deraa this morning, the 30th September, myself, and found the new Mutassarif, Fehin Bey, who only arrived five or six days ago from Constantinople, had come from Sheikh Muskin and was just starting for Suweida to found the civil administration there, while martial law, which had been announced as to be applied several weeks back, was being put into operation this very day. Sami Pasha had entered amid friendly acclamations with his column of men three days earlier. Part of the forces which entered Bosra-Eski-Sham some ten days ago have also been moved on to Salkhad, and in no quarter has any resistance been made at all.

At Deraa there was only one battalion and some sundry troops, and about 400 camels were ready for transport; the hospital was being well attended to; happily the health of the troops was excellent; there have been less than one per cent. cases of sickness. A slight shortage of water had been easily made good by bringing tanks from Mzerib, and there were numerous tanks about on trucks. At Habab, about half-way down the line, I noticed that soldiers came to beg water from the engine tank, bringing some skins and their large eating dishes to hold it, but could only be spared a little, but everywhere they appeared well dressed and fed and comfortable in their tents, which were to be seen from 10 miles south of this city, and especially a large camp at the south end of Jebel Maniyyé, between Kiswé and Deir-Ali; also camps at Mismié and each successive station to Deraa.

I have, &c.
G. P. DEVEY.

Enclosure 2 in No. 44.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Louther.

(No. 47.)

Sir, *Damascus, October* 5, 1910.

AMID the numerous conflicting reports as to what is taking place in Jebel Druze, it is difficult to ascertain the truth; but it seems certain that after quietly entering Suweida, Sami Pasha dispatched thence a force to Kanawat, some 6 miles distant, and that severe fighting for twenty-four hours was going on there on the 1st and 2nd instants.

It is rumoured that four battalions of the Redifs were entirely broken up and dispersed, many of them throwing away their rifles and losing two Maxims, and it is believed that nearly 100 were killed, including seven Turkish officers, while the destruction of Kanawat (some 400 houses), and the villages Oteil, Ain-Imsad, and Mifaleh will have entailed severe loss upon the Druzes, estimated according to the authorities at about 500 (and according to Druze statements 150) killed, among whom are two nephews of Yahia Atrash and the Sheikh of Sahwat-Belatat, which village, with those of Kafr and Rima, were taken after some fighting. Another place, Kenakir, was still holding out. Both parties are now greatly embittered, the Druzes accusing the troops of mishandling women, while there are vague assertions that the Druzes were proposing to massacre Christians, which must be absolutely untrue. The version of the fighting issued from official sources is that the troops by mistake at night fired upon one another.

An explosion of ammunition, but without loss of life, took place at Ahire, in the Lijah, which of course is being replaced.

The Bedouins seem to have been behaving very orderly, those to the north of the mountain having withdrawn from the scene of combat, and going about without arms profess they shall remain neutral. Sheikh Nouri of Ruwela, the large tribe to the south of the Jebel, some little while ago came to see Sami Pasha, and acquiesced fully in the Government views for progress and prosperity of his tribe, by inducing them gradually to settle and cultivate, and is keeping order on his side.

Yahia Bey was brought to Suweida on the 1st instant, and it is expected that he will be tried there very soon.

I have, &c.

G. P. DEVEY.

[38533] No. 45.

Sir G. Louther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 24.)

(No. 747.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 18, 1910.

IT recently came to the notice of the diplomatic missions here that the Hedjaz Railway Administration were insisting on the insertion in their contracts for supplies, &c., of a clause requiring that foreign subjects contracting with them should agree that any difference arising between the two parties on the interpretation or execution of contracts should be decided purely by Ottoman law, to the exclusion of all consular intervention or assistance; and that by the terms of the contracts made, foreign purveyors of goods were required to obtain the sanction of their embassy or Government to the above arrangement.

A *note verbale identique* was, accordingly, drawn up and agreed upon at the dragomans' meeting and sent in to the Porte on the 6th August last (copy enclosed), in which it is pointed out that these conditions cannot be admitted by the Powers, as they are in contravention of the principle of free trade and of existing treaty rights, while attributing to the foreign missions powers which they do not possess of authorising their compatriots to divest themselves of their privileges.

I have the honour to forward herewith the reply which has been sent by the Sublime Porte to this *note verbale*, which takes up the line that the contracts in question are a matter of ordinary purchase and sale and that, therefore, the buyer is free to impose what terms he pleases, which the vendor may accept or reject at will. The note maintains that no treaty rights are infringed by the conditions imposed and declines to approach the Hedjaz Railway Administration in the matter.

This note will be submitted to the dragomans' meeting in due course and a further

reply will have to be sent insisting on the original contention of the Powers; for the question is an important one and has already been combated in the matter of the Printing-Press Law regulations. In a matter of this kind, involving commercial competition, it is essential that all the Powers concerned should act in concert, and I see no indication that any of the missions will give way in the present instance.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 45.

Identic Note verbale communicated to Sublime Porte.

IL est parvenu à la connaissance de l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté britannique que la Direction générale du Chemin de Fer du Hedjaz insiste pour que dans les contrats de fournitures soient insérées des clauses tendant à poser aux sujets étrangers l'obligation de se soumettre, en cas de différends pouvant sugir par suite de l'interprétation ou de l'exécution des contrats, à la juridiction purement ottomane, à l'exclusion de toute intervention et assistance consulaires (article 14).

Un autre article de contrat exige du fournisseur étranger de faire approuver l'engagement dont il s'agit par l'ambassade ou le Gouvernement dont il relève (article 16).

Ces dispositions vont à l'encontre des principes de la liberté de commerce et sont inconciliables avec les droits que les traités existants reconnaissent aux sujets étrangers, ainsi qu'avec les obligations que leur sujétion impose à ces mêmes ressortissants vis-à-vis de leurs autorités naturelles. Elles excèdent, en outre—ainsi que l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté britannique a eu l'honneur de le faire remarquer dans sa note du 26 avril dernier concernant la Loi sur les Imprimeries—les attributions des missions diplomatiques, qui n'ont pas le pouvoir d'autoriser un de leurs ressortissants à renoncer aux privilèges se rattachant à sa nationalité.

Aussi l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté britannique se voit-elle obligée de faire toutes ses réserves quant aux clauses de ce genre qui auraient été déjà insérées dans des contrats de fournitures, ou qui seraient insérées par la suite, et de prier, en même temps, le Ministère Impérial de vouloir bien provoquer les ordres nécessaires pour que lesdites clauses ne soient plus imposées aux étrangers qui se trouveraient dans le cas de faire une convention quelconque avec les administrations Impériales.

Péra, le 6 août, 1910.

Enclosure 2 in No. 45.

Circular Note verbale from Sublime Porte.

LE Ministère des Affaires Étrangères a eu l'honneur de recevoir la note verbale que l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté britannique a bien voulu lui adresser en date du 6 août dernier, relativement aux contrats de fournitures de l'Administration du Chemin de Fer du Hedjaz.

En réponse, le Ministère Impérial croit devoir faire observer à l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté le Roi que le Gouvernement Impérial a, il est vrai, accordé aux étrangers le droit de séjourner, de voyager, et de se livrer au commerce en Turquie. Il a même supprimé en leur faveur certaines restrictions et coutumes qui paraissaient entraver l'exercice de ce droit. Mais il n'a jamais signé une clause contractuelle pouvant aliéner sa liberté ou celles de ses ressortissants dans leurs transactions commerciales avec les étrangers. En d'autres termes, en accordant la liberté de commerce il n'a jamais engagé sa propre liberté vis-à-vis d'eux.

Étant donné, d'autre part, que tout achat ou vente est un pacte volontaire conclu entre l'acheteur et le vendeur, qui sont libres de se poser et d'accepter toute condition non contraire à la loi, l'administration susdite n'a fait qu'user de sa liberté en posant à ses fournisseurs les conditions qu'elle a jugées les plus favorables, de même que ceux-ci sont libres de ne pas les accepter au cas où elles ne seraient pas à leur convenance.

D'ailleurs, l'insertion dans les contrats passés entre le Gouvernement Impérial et les étrangers de pareilles conditions ne sont pas sans précédents. C'est ainsi qu'il est

d'usage, lorsque les dimes qui, en principe, doivent être affermées à des sujets ottomans, sont soumissionnées par des sujets étrangers, de faire approuver par la mission ou le consulat dont ils relèvent l'engagement que ceux-ci prennent d'être traités comme sujets ottomans dans les différends se rapportant aux contrats y relatifs.

Dans ces conditions, le fait qu'une administration indépendante, agissant en qualité d'acheteur, demande à ses fournisseurs étrangers de se soumettre individuellement et de leur plein gré aux clauses insérées dans ses contrats, ne saurait en aucune façon constituer une atteinte aux dispositions des traités en vigueur.

Néanmoins, il appartient à l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté britannique d'apprécier si elle doit priver ses ressortissants des bénéfices que leur assureraient les fournitures qu'ils seraient appelés à faire, en refusant son approbation à l'engagement auquel celles-ci restent subordonnées.

Pour ces raisons, le Ministère Impérial regrette de ne pouvoir intervenir dans cette question auprès de l'Administration des Chemins de Fer du Hedjaz.

Sublime Porte, le 17 octobre, 1910.

[38537]

No. 46.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 24.)

(No. 751.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 18, 1910.

IN my despatch No. 725 of the 12th instant, I had the honour to forward to you a detailed report from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad regarding the attempts of the local authorities to close two ice factories there belonging to a British Indian subject, Abdul Ali.

In that despatch Mr. Lorimer gave such a full and clear account of the incident that it is unnecessary for me to give any further explanation, but it still remains for me to inform you of the steps I have taken here to check the vali's arbitrary action in the matter.

On receiving the first intimation from Mr. Lorimer on the 26th August last that the vali was threatening to enforce the closure of Abdul Ali's two factories, after failing to prevail upon him to reduce the price of the ice, I caused representations to be made at the Sublime Porte, and received a promise from the Minister for Foreign Affairs that he would telegraph to the Vali of Bagdad for an explanation of the threatened interference.

On the 28th August I received a further telegram from Mr. Lorimer, informing me that the vali adhered to his intention of closing the factories, no longer on the ground that they had been established without permission, but that their establishment was not authorised by the law of 1864. The latter contention, as will be seen from the enclosed memorandum from Mr. Weakley, is entirely unfounded, and the Turkish text of the law bears it out even less than the French.

I again made urgent written and verbal representations at the Porte, and as a consequence instructions were sent to the vali to suspend the closing of the factories, and to report the matter to Constantinople for discussion of the question here.

These latter instructions appear to have had some effect, for the vali took no further steps in the matter, and Mr. Lorimer, telegraphing on the 9th instant, in reply to an enquiry on my part, stated that he had had no further trouble regarding the ice factories.

In the meanwhile, however, the owner of the ice factories had suffered considerable losses to his trade owing to the vali's arbitrary action, and the question remains as to how this claim for these losses can best be pressed. Under the new régime the proper course would, of course, be for him to sue the municipality for damages, but in the present case Nazim Pasha and the municipality have identic interests in ruining the business of the ice factories and so acquiring a monopoly. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that Abdul Ali should not have much confidence in the impartiality of the law.

Moreover, as Mr. Lorimer has with the vali taken the line that the question is one of difference in interpretation of the law of 1864, and should be settled here, I am of opinion that the best course will be to send in a *note verbale* to the Sublime Porte, claiming compensation on behalf of Abdul Ali for the losses inflicted up to the present, and for any eventual losses which he may suffer from any further arbitrary action on the part of the local authorities.

The great difficulty that I have to encounter here in this case, as in the question of the demolition of property (see my despatch No. 718 of the 10th October and previous correspondence), from which it seems likely that Abdul Ali's premises may also suffer, is that the Central Government evidently hesitate to attempt to force the local authorities to abide by the laws, and shelter themselves behind the fiction that Turkey has become a "constitutional country" with only the same legal remedies that exist in western States. I am putting in a written application to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, requesting him to instruct the Bagdad local authorities to indemnify Abdul Ali for his losses. Should this produce no result, the only course left open will be to hold the Central Government responsible in the matter.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 46.

Memorandum by Mr. Weakley.

[Letter from Vali of Bagdad to His Majesty's Consul-General, Bagdad, dated August 15 (28), 1910, *re* Abdul Ali's Ice Factories.]

IN this as well as the second letter of the 31st August, Nazim Pasha bases his decision for closing Abdul Ali's ice factories on the ground that Abdul Ali has not complied with the stipulations of the regulations concerning "Usines et Machines à Vapeur" of the 15th May, 1864, from which Nazim Pasha gives extracts in support of his decision. The main points of his contention are, that Abdul Ali has obtained no authorisation to erect and work factories, that the regulations invoked stipulate the necessity of obtaining such authorisation, and therefore these factories must be closed.

The French text of the regulations from which Nazim Pasha draws his quotations is found in Young's "Corps de Droit ottoman," vol. 2, p. 310, and is Aristarchi's translation, which, when compared with the official Turkish text, is certainly defective and most misleading.

The title of the regulations is not "Usines et Machines à Vapeur," but "Law concerning Stationary Steam Engines," and, curiously, does not deal with engines at all, but simply defines the conditions under which the boilers, called in the Turkish text steam generators, will be permitted to be used.

The law is divided into four chapters or sections:—

1. Conditions for the erection of steam generators.
2. Concerning safety valves to be used with steam generators.
3. Concerning the use of smoke-consuming apparatus in chimneys.

Article 12 in this chapter (quoted by Nazim Pasha) states that in future persons who intend using steam generators, that is, stationary engine boilers, or those persons who already have erected boilers without authorisation must apply for such authorisation from the Ministry of Public Works. In their request for permits, they must state:—

1. The highest working pressure of the steam generator.
2. The shape of such steam generator and boiler tubes, if there be any.
3. The locality where it is to be erected.
4. The kind of fuel which is to be used.
5. The nature of the work the boiler is to be used for.
6. A plan of the factory and its immediate neighbourhood, drawn up on a scale of 1 in 200.

Article 13 states that permits granted for using steam generators will be issued subject to the payment of 10 gold medjidié pieces for each steam generator.

Chapter 4 defines the penalties to which persons will be liable in case of non-observance of the stipulations of the law.

It is perfectly clear that this law has no reference to the conditions for the establishment of factories nor does it regulate the use of engines, but simply has in view the control of stationary steam boilers in order to ensure their safe working. By no manner of means can Nazim Pasha invoke any of the clauses of this law in justification of his action in threatening to close Abdul Ali's factories. Oil engines cannot come

under this law either, as no boilers are used; there are many of them at present in use all over the country, and no authorisation has ever been considered necessary, nor has anything like a permit been insisted upon.

E. WEAKLEY.

[38783] No. 47.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 24.)

(No. 232.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, October 24, 1910.*

INTENSE, though I hope only temporary, irritation has been caused here by the support given to France during the recent loan negotiations. It has been further increased by the accounts circulated of our intended action in Persia and has found expression in violent outbursts against Great Britain accompanied by manifestations in favour of Germany (see my telegram No. 231). In view of this I venture to suggest that it would be expedient to defer the communication in writing of your despatch No. 312 of the 17th October until the ill-feeling has abated, as it would be interpreted as a condemnation of the new régime, would be at once communicated to the committee in an inaccurate Turkish translation, and would only result in an increase of pro-German and anti-British sentiment.

A claim in writing for property losses as well as those of the ice factories has already been sent in, and the central Government is in communication with the authorities at Bagdad.

Orders for the withdrawal of the post at Zakhmuniyeh have been issued, and the appointment of the Mudir of Odeid is to be cancelled. The recall of the Vali of Bussorah can be considered locally as a reprimand for his high-handed action with regard to the Sheikh of Mohammerah. Furthermore I would venture to point out that, at the present moment, any written allusion to our relations with the sheikh would only tend to heighten the suspicions of our aggressive policy in the south of Persia, suspicions which are fomented by Germany and by her Turkish organs.

Should the suggestion of postponing the communication meet with your approval, I would, in the meantime, make unofficial but forcible representations to the Sublime Porte with regard to the registration of land belonging to the Sheikhs of Koweit and Mohammerah. I would suggest that, if the orders for the removal of the post at Zakhmuniyeh are not put into execution, steps might be taken for transporting them, politely and, if necessary, firmly, to Katif without giving any more warning than the Turks did in sending them thither.

With regard to your despatch No. 107 of the 20th April, which up till now has received no acknowledgment, I have a strong suspicion that the committee may have communicated its contents to the local authorities in Mesopotamia and that it is this that has led them to adopt an attitude of aggression with the intention of undermining our prestige in those quarters.

The most efficacious means of putting a check on the ultra-nationalist proclivities of the present inexperienced Turkish rulers would appear to be to reduce them by financial starvation to a becoming sense of their own proportion in international politics.

[37537] No. 48.

Foreign Office to Messrs. Lynch Brothers.

Gentlemen, *Foreign Office, October 21, 1910.*

WITH reference to the memorandum communicated to this department on the 12th instant by Colonel Picot, regarding the destruction of part of your premises at Bagdad, I am directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to inform you that on the 8th instant His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople in a note to the Turkish Government requested that orders might be sent to the local authorities at Bagdad to indemnify the British subjects for the losses incurred by them owing to the arbitrary destruction of their property.

In reports received from Sir G. Lowther it is stated that your firm contemplated

bringing an action for damages against the Turkish authorities. I am to enquire whether you have taken any steps in this direction.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[38847] No. 49.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 25.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of enclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 6th October, 1910, relative to the registration of the Sheikh of Koweit's properties on the Shatt-el-Arab.

India Office, October 24, 1910.

Enclosure 1 in No. 49.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cox to Government of India.

(Confidential.)
Sir, *Bushire, September 25, 1910.*

IN continuation of my telegram dated the 2nd September, 1910, I have the honour to submit the result of the enquiries made by the Political Agent, Koweit, from Sheikh Mubarak as to how the registration question in connection with his properties on the Shatt-el-Arab had been solved in the past.

2. The present position is recapitulated by Captain Shakespear in the concluding paragraph of his report, and it will be remarked that in the last transaction put through—the transfer of part of the Mutawiah property from Hamid-el-Khalil to the sheikh—nationality certificates were insisted on, and the difficulty got over by the acceptance of such certificates by one wife and two concubines of Sheikh Mubarak.

3. The attitude assumed by the Turkish authorities in this case and in respect of the Fadaghia transaction is not compatible with the position claimed by Mr. Crow and and accepted by Vali Sulimun Nazif Bey's predecessor, as set forth in the papers quoted in my telegram of the 2nd instant, but in existing circumstances the settlement of the difficulty by the registration of the property in the names of the same three ladies or the sheikh's blind son seems the simplest solution, though the fact that the formal good offices of His Majesty's Embassy should take the form of such a suggestion seems to me to bear a somewhat inconvenient aspect in reference to our attitude upon the question of the status of Koweit, an aspect which the Sheikhs of Koweit and Mohammerah may not impossibly regard as indicative of a change of policy on our part.

For this reason, should the solution of the Fadaghia question assume the above shape, I venture to advise that, in order to maintain a consistent attitude locally, we inform Sheikh Mubarak that we learn that the Porte are inclined to compromise with him on those lines, and that, as his financial interests are so strongly concerned, we do not propose to complicate matters by raising any objections.

I have, &c.
P. Z. COX,
Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.

Enclosure 2 in No. 49.

Captain Shakespear to Lieutenant-Colonel Cox.

(Confidential.)
Sir, *Koweit, September 14, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to invite a reference to the Government of India's telegram dated the 21st August, 1910, a copy of which was forwarded to me under your second assistant's endorsement dated the 23rd August, 1910.

2. On my return to Koweit I brought up the subject of his properties on the Shatt-el-Arab in two interviews with the sheikh. Sheikh Mubarak tells me that

originally there were five properties, named respectively Kutizain, Gherdilan, Ajerawiya, Fao, and Sufieh, in the joint possession of the Subah family, and a small one, Farhaniya (also known as Dowasir), which has been Mubarak's in his own separate right from a very long time. The first five were redistributed as the result of the agreement come to between Sheikh Mubarak and his nephews in September 1903, a copy of which is already on the residency records. As a result of this agreement Mubarak gave up his interest in the other four estates for the exclusive right to Fao, retaining, of course, the small separate one of Farhaniya, which was already his own.

Thus we have now only to deal with the Fao estate, the Farhaniya estate, and the gardens subsequently purchased.

3. Both the Fao and Farhaniya estates were inherited, and as regards them no demand has ever been made for registration in the "Tapu" Office books and they have never been so registered. The sheikh says his title to these two consists of documents from his forefathers of the nature of testamentary, gift, or mutual agreement deeds.

4. From the end of 1907 to beginning of 1909 he purchased what is now described as the Mutawiah property from Sheikh Sadun, of the Muntifieh, and Abdur Rahman Beg, his brother. The property consisted of two main divisions known as Shaleh and Hizan, but the vendors owned portions in each division. Sheikh Mubarak purchased first Abdur Rahman's land directly from him, and, no difficulties being made by the Turkish authorities as to nationality certificates, had it registered at once in the "Tapu" Office books in the names of his four sons. For various reasons he did not wish to purchase direct from Sheikh Sadun, and therefore, though he provided the money, the sale-deed was drawn in the name of Hamid-el-Khalid and the transfer effected to this man's name in the "Tapu" Office. This is the same man who was reported by my predecessor as forced to take out a Turkish nationality certificate to protect himself in his trade dealings in Bussorah. Some time subsequently the sheikh saw no use in leaving this land in Hamid-el-Khalid's name, and therefore had fresh sale-deeds made out authenticating a sale from Hamid to himself, and had the transfer duly registered in the "Tapu" Office books in the names of three of his womenkind (one being the mother of Sheikh Jabir and the other two concubines). On this occasion, which, I am now told, occurred some time last year, the authorities insisted on nationality certificates, and accordingly these documents were taken out for the three women.

5. There remains only the Fadaghia property, which consists of portions named Al Khuram, Al Bashiya, and Fadaghia, but the whole is now always called Fadaghia. This property was purchased from Ahmed Pasha-az-Zuhair's family, and four sale-deeds were executed, all of which were witnessed by most of the notables in Bussorah. It was a condition cited in these deeds that the transfer in the "Tapu" Office books should be carried out by the vendor party, the vendee paying all expenses. It is in this case that the Turkish authorities are obstructive by demanding that this property must be registered in the names of the sheikh's four sons, and that they shall all take out Turkish nationality certificates.

6. To recapitulate, the sheikh's properties now consist of—

(*a.*) The Fao and Farhaniya estates, acquired by inheritance and not registered in the "Tapu" Office.

(*b.*) The Mutawiah property of Shaleh and Hizan, acquired by purchase in 1907–8 and duly registered in the "Tapu" Office, partly in the names of the sheikh's four sons, who did not take out nationality certificates, and partly in the names of three of his women, for whom nationality certificates were taken out some time last year.

(*c.*) The Fadaghia estates, acquired by purchase in 1908–9, and as yet not registered owing to Turkish officials insisting that sheikh's four sons should take out nationality papers and the transfer be made to their names.

I have, &c.
W. H. I. SHAKESPEAR,
Political Agent, Koweit.

[38897] No. 50.

Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to Foreign Office.—(Received October 25.)

3, *Salter's Hall Court, Cannon Street, London, October* 24, 1910.

Sir,

WITH reference to our letter of the 13th July last, informing you that the Vali of Bussorah had notified his intention to prevent us from exercising our right to use our reserve steamer on the Tigris in place of any of our steamers which may have to be temporarily withdrawn from service, I have the honour to inform you that, in consequence of an accident to the machinery of one of our steamers, we are withdrawing that steamer temporarily from service for repairs, and we are instructing our agent at Bussorah to substitute in her place the reserve steamer, P. S. "Blosse Lynch."

I have, &c.
H. W. MACLEAN, *Secretary.*

[38783] No. 51.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 323.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, October* 26, 1910.

TURKISH aggression in Persian Gulf.

Please refer to your telegram No. 232 of the 24th instant.

In present circumstances I am willing to agree to your not communicating to the Porte the despatch in writing. In regard to the Smyrna-Aidin Railway, however, you should make strong representations in writing; and with regard to the registration of the lands of the Sheikhs of Mohammerah and Koweit, you should, as you propose, personally make representations. You should insist on a prompt reply being given to your demands by the Central Government, whom, I presume, you have held responsible for all property losses.

[37935] No. 52.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 326.)
Sir, *Foreign Office, October* 28, 1910.

WITH reference to previous correspondence, and especially to my despatch No. 169 of the 17th June, 1910, regarding the position of the Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company on the rivers of Mesopotamia, I transmit to you herewith copy of a letter from the company[a] drawing attention to the permits granted to natives for navigating these rivers, and enquiring if His Majesty's Government would acquiesce in their sending a tug and barge up the River Euphrates. They also suggest forming an Ottoman company to ply on both the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers and their tributaries.

So long as the position of the company on the rivers is not threatened by changes in the *status quo ante*, I am prepared to leave things as they are for the present. I consider it, however, essential, to obtain for them such freedom as is necessary to enable them to protect their position from the evil effects of increased competition.

I therefore request your Excellency to furnish to me your views as to the state of affairs described and the proposals put forward in the enclosed letter.

I am, &c.
E. GREY.

---

[a] No. 53.

[39310] No. 53.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 29.)

Sir, *India Office, October 28, 1910.*

WITH reference to the letter of your department of the 26th October, I am directed to say, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that the Secretary of State for India observes with regret that His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople has been authorised to defer communication to the Turkish Government of Sir E. Grey's despatch of the 17th October.

Viscount Morley ventures to suggest that Sir G. Lowther's telegram No. 232 of the 24th October contains no considerations that could not have been foreseen when the despatch in question issued. It must have been anticipated that the despatch, whenever communicated, would be made the occasion for an explosion of anti-British feeling, and the fact that one such explosion has already been manufactured in connection with the wholly irrelevant question of the British note to the Persian Government seems to his Lordship to be rather a reason why His Majesty's Government should persist in their firm policy.

Their object, as Lord Morley understands it, is less to secure an adjustment of the particular incidents in question than to impress upon the Turkish Government in a manner that shall preclude further misunderstanding the importance which they attach to their interests in those regions and their determination to see that they are respected. The incidents are indeed, in themselves, of varying degrees of magnitude; but their cumulative effect is very considerable, and the force of our protest is proportionately greater. His Lordship apprehends that this advantage will be almost wholly lost, and the probability of His Majesty's Government attaining their object greatly diminished, if the general protest is long deferred and if His Majesty's Ambassador proceeds by means of piece-meal representations in the meantime, while the policy of financial starvation, recommended as an alternative by Sir G. Lowther, seems no more likely to be successful in Turkey than it has been in Persia.

Lord Morley is conscious that there may be other considerations lying outside his competence which outweigh those here suggested. But as he was consulted regarding the drafting and issue of the despatch, he has ventured to make these remarks solely from the point of view of the interests which he is entitled to represent.

I am, &c.
R. RITCHIE.

[39388] No. 54.

Messrs. Lynch Brothers to Foreign Office.—(Received October 29.)

3, Salters' Hall Court, Cannon Street, London,
Sir, *October 28, 1910.*

WE have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th instant, on the subject of our premises at Bagdad. In reply we would venture to express our great surprise at the nature of this communication. In the course of recent personal interviews at the Foreign Office we were clearly given to understand that it had been decided that His Majesty's Embassy in Constantinople should hold the central Government responsible for losses incurred by British subjects in Bagdad owing to the arbitrary action of the vali and the local authorities, and that His Majesty's consul-general in Bagdad would shortly receive instructions to make a valuation of all properties affected, and to submit this valuation to His Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople. We accordingly telegraphed this information to our agents at Bagdad, instructing them to give the consul-general every assistance in making the valuation, and to associate themselves with his action.

We earnestly trust that no departure may be made by His Majesty's Government from this course of procedure, upon which we have already taken action. It is only by holding the central Government responsible and obtaining settlement in Constantinople of the matter at issue that there is any likelihood of getting justice done.

In reply to the last paragraph of your letter, we have not contemplated bringing an action for damages against the Turkish authorities. To place this matter before

the local courts at Bagdad would be to invite disaster. The state of affairs at Bagdad at the present time is such that it is improbable that any lawyer could be found to oppose the projects of the vali. It is certain that justice would not be done to us were we to follow such a course.

We have, &c.
LYNCH BROTHERS.

[39424] No. 55.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 29.)

(No. 237.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, October 29, 1910.*

HIS Majesty's consul at Damascus telegraphs that it now seems that the Druse revolt has practically come to an end. Kindness and tact are, he says, being displayed by General Sami Pasha. The Lija has been abandoned, and the authorities are taking a census of the whole district.

[39425] No. 56.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 29.)

(No. 238.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, October 29, 1910.*

IN a telegram dispatched on the 25th instant, His Majesty's consul at Bussorah reports a raid upon the date plantation at Zedaghia. Both he and His Majesty's consul at Mohammerah believe it to be the work of ex-labourers, whereas the Turks assume that the aggression was made by robbers from the Persian side. A Turkish gun-boat was sent and some shots were fired. It is reported that the vali endeavoured to persuade the Administrative Council to give their consent to an attack on Mohammerah and Failich, but the latter refused, and thereupon the question was referred to Constantinople for decision. In unofficial representations I have deprecated the employment of violent measures, and have urged friendly co-operation with the sheikh generally.

[39452] No. 57.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 31.)

(No. 756.)
Sir, *Constantinople, October 21, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 751 of the 19th instant, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of a *note verbale* addressed to the Sublime Porte on the subject of the closing of the ice factories at Bagdad belonging to British Indian subjects by the Bagdad local authorities.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 57.

Note verbale communicated to Sublime Porte.

HIS Britannic Majesty's Embassy has the honour to draw the attention of the Sublime Porte to the following case, which has already formed the subject of conversations between His Majesty's Ambassador and his Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

About the middle of July last an order was issued by the municipal authorities of Bagdad decreeing that ice was to be sold at a rate not exceeding 10 paras per kilogramme. Considering that previous to this date ice had fetched as much as 40 paras, and in summer even 50 and 60 paras per kilogramme, the price fixed by this new order was entirely arbitrary, and, moreover, it does not appear that ice comes under the category of necessary articles of food for which the municipality has any right to fix a price under the Law of Provincial Municipalities.

As the Sublime Porte are no doubt aware, there are at Bagdad two ice factories owned by the British Indian subjects, Messrs. Abdul Ali. The Bagdad authorities proceeded to try and force these merchants to sell their ice at the price now fixed. Failing in this attempt they approached His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad to co-operate with them in forcing Messrs. Abdul Ali to close their factories altogether as contravening the terms of the law of 1864, which is, however, concerned with steam-engines and boilers only, whereas the ice factories in question are run by smokeless and non-dangerous oil-engines. His Majesty's consul-general was compelled to protest against any such action, based on a complete misinterpretation of the law, and referred the authorities to Constantinople, where, it is understood, orders have been issued for the suspension of proceedings against Abdul Ali pending further consideration of the case.

In the meanwhile, the losses suffered by the owners of the factories have been considerable. Calculated at the lowest estimate (*i.e.*, 20 paras per kilogramme) at which they could have sold their ice during the summer months, the losses sustained by Messrs. Abdul Ali as a result of the interference with their trade from the 22nd July to the 14th August, during which period they were compelled to sell 98,781 kilog. at 10 paras each, amount to a sum of £ T. 228, which sum does not of course cover any subsequent losses that may be incurred. His Majesty's Embassy is convinced that the Sublime Porte will admit the injustice of the proceedings of the local authorities at Bagdad, and it has the honour to request that instructions will be sent to the Bagdad vilayet to desist from all further attempts to close the ice factories in question and to indemnify Messrs. Abdul Ali for the losses sustained by them owing to the arbitrary and illegal action of the authorities.

Pera, October 19, 1910.

[39459] No. 58.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 31.)

(No. 764.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 25, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's acting consul-general at Beirout reporting on local affairs in the Beirout consular district, for the quarter ended the 30th September.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 58.

Acting Consul-General Young to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 46.)

Sir, *Beirout, October* 1, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to submit to your Excellency the following notes on local affairs in this district during the past three months:—

1. Perfect tranquillity prevails at Beirout and throughout the vilayet.

2. Noureddin Bey, the vali, who arrived here last June, gives the impression of being a cautious and sensible official, and, so far as can be judged, has hitherto performed his duties very fairly satisfactorily.

3. The mudir of police, Jemal Bey, though he has only been here about three months, has already achieved a good deal, and his approaching transfer to Constantinople seems to be a matter for regret. It is understood that he has obtained authorisation to increase the Beirout police by ninety men, ten of whom will be mounted.

4. The newly organised gendarmerie appear to be doing extremely well, and to have inspired general respect and confidence.

The judicial departments are said to dispose of their work more expeditiously, and, on the whole, more satisfactorily, than of old, and at the moment complaints are comparatively few.

6. The departure of Faik Bey, inspector-general of customs, who has been at Beirout during the past year, is regretted. He has done good work towards reorganising

his department, and appears to have won the regard of those who came in contact with him.

7. The Greek boycott continues.

8. Owing partly, perhaps, to lack of funds and partly to complete inexperience and ignorance of their duties, the municipality have so far failed to introduce any serious improvements, and Beirout remains one of the least attractive of Levantine towns, though its position, of course, fits it to become something very different.

9. The new railway from Tripoli to Homs is said to be nearing completion. It is hoped to have it open for traffic at the beginning of next year. As pointed out in the commercial report on this district last May, when its railway is finished Tripoli is likely to become a dangerous rival to Beyrout.

10. Tranquillity has prevailed in the Lebanon during the past three months, and internal squabbles have been fewer, or, at all events, less conspicuous than usual. In spite of rumours to the contrary, there appears to have been no movement worth mentioning between the Lebanon and the Hauran; and the Lebanese notables, far from contemplating steps to assist the Druses of the Hauran, are understood to have advised the latter, in various telegrams and letters, to offer speedy submission to the Ottoman Government.

I have, &c.
H. E. WILKIE YOUNG.

[39460] No. 59.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 31.)

(No. 765.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 25, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 537 of the 3rd August, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Damascus, forwarding the quarterly report on the Damascus vilayet.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 59.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 49.)

Sir, *Damascus, October* 11, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to submit the usual quarterly report on this district, which has been disturbed by misconduct on the part of Druses since early July; the proceedings of the forces employed with a view to establish law and administration in their mountainous district, which only began in the last week of September, are described elsewhere.

The aggressive action of local authorities against foreigners generally provoked a joint remonstrance on the part of the chief consulates just a month ago; the Italian consul arrived only at that moment, or else would have been invited to join his colleagues.

Deputies of the Medjliss returned for a vacation and were received with acclamations, and now most of them have gone back to Constantinople for the session to be opened next month.

Among changes of officials may be noted the loss by dismissal, unfortunately, of an active Alai Bey (Husni Bey), an infantry major who was for many years drill instructor at the Constantinople Military Academy; while the place of Ruhi Bey was taken in July by Nafiz Bey, as chief of police, who showed himself active in collecting arms, but has by no means won the good opinion of foreign consuls.

The artillery and various sections of the military were busy with exercises and practice during the month of July, but since August their attention was occupied with preparations for the expedition against the Druses.

A German, Captain von Hochwächter, arrived three months ago as cavalry instructor, and was actively engaged in forming a model squadron, but several of his more promising officers have been told off for service in the Hauran.

The Kaïmakam of Zebdani and Katana districts exchanged places.

Aram Effendi Kourdajian, an inspector of the finance department, has been staying here some three months, and found some difficulty in carrying out his mission.

Sadik Bey, procureur général of Aidin vilayet, was appointed here president of the commercial court, and Abd-el-Aziz Bey, ex-member of the appeal court, is promoted muawin to the procureur général.

The municipal elections were lately completed, and many changes have been made; Chalib Bey received most votes, but Mohamad Pasha Adm was selected by the vali, with Yahia Effendi Sawaf and Ahmed Bey Shama as first and second members. The latter has now resigned, and is succeeded by Ali Effendi Asali.

General dissatisfaction is murmured on all sides in respect of arbitrary and unjust acts of the authorities, while it is often averred that corruption is as bad or worse than during the reign of Abdul Hamid.

I have, &c.
G. P. DEVEY.

[39461] No. 60.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 31.)

(No. 766.)
Sir, *Constantinople, October 25, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 745 of the 18th October, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Damascus reporting further on the campaign against the Druses.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 60.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 50.)
Sir, *Damascus, October 12, 1910.*

IN continuation of my despatch No. 47, I have the honour to report that the true state of affairs in Jebel Druse remains extremely obscure, the Druses no doubt exaggerating their doings greatly, while the Government reports minimise absurdly the losses of the troops as shown by the local press.

Troops have just been moved northwards from Sweidah on Shuhba, and presumably a force has moved eastward from Mismiye and Deyr Ali on Burak and Suweira, while the Druses have gathered to the number of 8,000, it is said, above Shuhba, and some are also believed to be in the Lijah.

The Bedouin tribes Sardiye and Sawalme, always allied to the Druses, are said to have joined them, and these number 3,000.

From Druse sources it is averred that five battalions have been dispersed and four guns taken; also that a convoy of thirty-three camels with 1,000 Mausers and ammunition was captured between Suweida and Kefr, and that there are many soldiers living with them as prisoners or deserters; while I learn that the military authorities admit of a loss of thirty-five soldiers and three officers killed as a maximum, while the Druses losses in killed and wounded amount to 500.

It seems that a decisive struggle is imminent at this moment near Shuhba, and that if Sami Pasha succeeds in inflicting a really crushing blow that might practically end the insurrection.

The telegraph wire which was cut between Seida and Sheikh Miskin was soon repaired, while no attack (as has been apprehended last week) was delivered by the Druses on Deraa.

I have, &c.
G. P. DEVEY.

P.S. *October* 13.—Sami Pasha has telegraphed that Shuhba was occupied yesterday without resistance, and it is generally believed that the Druses will soon be making submission, though there are said to be about 3,000 now in the Lijah.

G. P. D.

[39463] No. 61.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 31.)

(No. 768.)
Sir, *Constantinople, October 25, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 725 of the 11th October, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general, Bagdad, submitting correspondence with the vali on the subject of the demolition of a house belonging to Seyyid Ali Khan, a British Indian subject, at Kazimain.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 61.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 830/47.)
Your Excellency, *Bagdad, September 21, 1910.*

IN continuation of my despatch of the 6th September, 1910, I have the honour to enclose papers relating to a case in which it is proposed wrongfully to demolish some immovable property owned by Seyyid Ali Khan, a British Indian subject, at Kazimain.

Except that in this case some superficial repairs appear to be required, the circumstances are exactly similar to those of the wall and shops belonging to Messrs. Lynch Brothers at Bagdad, which have already been unjustifiably destroyed.

In both these cases, as also in that of Mr. G. Thaddeus's shop at Bagdad, it is worth remarking that the alternative of repairing their properties was not offered to the owners; and this, although, in Messrs. Lynch's and Mr. Thaddeus's cases, the buildings were in so good a state as not even to need repairs. The explanation, of course, is that their removal is desired not in the interests of the public safety, but for an ulterior purpose. In the case of the building at Kazimain, I am not yet aware what that purpose is.

The vilayet having rejected my intervention, as the enclosed correspondence shows, I had the honour of telegraphing to your Excellency yesterday about Seyyid Ali Khan's case. I then suggested that your Excellency, to avert an act of grave injustice to a British subject, might be able to arrange for an order to repair being substituted for the order to demolish, or at least for obtaining a respite of execution until this present despatch should have reached your Excellency.

I may add that before addressing the vilayet I carefully examined the Turkish law on the subject of overhead buildings, and that I failed to find there any provision which could legalise the removal of Seyyid Ali Khan's arch and upper storey. This point (viz., of the building being an overhead one) may, however, be subsequently raised by the vilayet.

I have, &c.
J. G. LORIMER, *I.C.S.*,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

Enclosure 2 in No. 61.

Order by the Resident to Mr. Abdur Rabb.

PLEASE accompany Seyyid Ali Khan to Kazimain and see his property which is threatened with demolition. I should like to have an exact description of it, particularly the height of the bridge above the level of the street, and whether it is in good condition.

You should go with Seyyid Ali Khan to the municipal offices and enquire under what law and article it is proposed to take action. Is it the law of the 18th Muharram, 1309? If so, unless the bridge is in bad condition, the destruction of it does not appear to be regular. You might also remark on no written notice having been given to the proprietor.

You should ask the municipality to delay action until the matter has been properly discussed and settled. If they do not agree to this, I shall have to refer to the vali, and you may tell them so.

September 6, 1910. J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 3 in No. 61.

Report of Mr. Abdur Rabb.

I EXAMINED the bridge belonging to Seyyid Ali Khan's house at Kazimain yesterday. This bridge is built north-south and has three rooms on it, which form the "diwankhana" of the house. The length of the bridge ("tak") is about 23 feet, and the width at the foundation about 7½ feet and at the top 7¾ feet. Height at the northern entrance is 7¾ feet, in the middle 6¾ feet, and at the southern entrance 6 feet only. The difference of height at three different points is due to the unevenness of the street.

The "tak" (bridge) is in thorough good condition, except in one place where three or four bricks seem to slightly tremble when touched, rather tapped, with a stick, and this is due to the removal of the cement. In two other places, too, 3 or 4 inches of cement plaster has fallen off, but the bricks are in perfect order and not in the least shaky. The three or four bricks mentioned above will become firm by the application of a very small quantity of cement or the mortar which they generally use. With this exception the "tak" is otherwise quite safe.

After the examination of the "tak" I went to the municipality. I opened the subject with the president. At the very outset he showed me a letter, dated the 14th Aghustoos, from the vali, in which he says that the chief engineer of the vilayet, who had been sent on purpose to examine the Kazimain town, recommends the demolition of the following (here names the places), and therefore these may be demolished as soon as possible. The "tak" of Seyyid Ali Khan was included in the list. The president said he is ready to oblige me in everything, but as it was the order of the vali he was powerless. However, he would delay the demolition for a week. Upon this I told him that the verbal notice is nothing and the regular thing was to have given a written notice to the owner. The president replied that he knew nothing of the law. The vali's order was a sufficient authority for him. But as I and Seyyid Ali Khan were his friends he would do anything to please us. "Only come with me," he said, "to the kaimakam and we shall settle the matter there."

We went to the kaimakam. The subject was opened by me. I talked to him as I had done to the president, in the light of your note. He also informed me that it was the order of the vali, based on the report of the chief engineer, and that he would delay the demolition for a week or ten days till the matter is discussed. But if I talked of law and legality of things, I should refer to the vilayet, and not to him, because he was not authorised to have direct dealings with foreign consulates. As he seemed a little flushed, I turned the matter into a joke, threw down on the table the vali's letter I had in my hand, and said, here goes the law! Will you not delay taking action till the matter is settled? The kaimakam was all smiles in a moment; he laughed, and promised to wait a week or two. Upon this we took leave and came away.

For information.

September 7, 1910. ABDUR RABB.

Enclosure 4 in No. 61.

Report by Mr. J. C. Gaskin, Commercial Assistant, on a Verbal Order from the Resident.

I HAVE seen the arch of Seyyid Ali Khan's house at Kazimain.

The dimensions given in the above note, as regards height and breadth of the arch, appear to be correct.

The arch and supporting walls are built of bricks and juss, but, owing to neglect, the pointing of the walls has worn away, and the juss between the bricks of the walls has corroded to a depth of an inch or more, giving the walls an appearance of unusual decay. The arch itself is perfect, having no crack indicating a subsidence or movement in the supporting walls.

In my opinion the walls and arch are perfectly safe for another five or six years, even if no attention is paid to them, but if generally done up and repointed they will last for many years yet.

The road thereabouts is merely a lane, and not a thoroughfare, through which a general traffic passes. Judging from its locality, I should think that seldom any loaded animals or horsemen, excepting donkeys carrying water-skins pass under the arch.

J. C. GASKIN.

September 9, 1910.

Enclosure 5 in No. 61.

Consul-General Lorimer to M. A. Eram Bey.

Dear M. Eram Bey, *Bagdad, September* 6, 1910.

SEYYID ALI KHAN, one of the principal British Indian subjects at Bagdad, has been verbally informed by the Kazimain municipality that three rooms of his, which are built over a street there, are in a dangerous condition, and must be removed. As he represented that they were not dangerous, I sent first a native employé of this consulate-general, and then Mr. Gaskin, to see them, and both officers report that they are not dangerous.

Would you kindly look into this question without delay, in order that the municipality may not take hasty and, perhaps, illegal action, as, according to our view, the Bagdad municipality did in the case of Messrs. Lynch. It would be very unfortunate if a fresh case had to be referred to Constantinople.

I have, &c.

J. G. LORIMER.

[No reply to this letter was received.]

Enclosure 6 in No. 61.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Bagdad.

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, September* 15, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that, according to information which I have received, an arch and upper storey belonging to Seyyid Ali Khan, a British Indian subject, have been condemned as insecure and ordered to be destroyed. I have caused the building to be examined by two representatives of this consulate-general separately. Both of these have given it as their opinion that it is in no way insecure.

Will your Excellency in these circumstances consider the propriety of causing this order of the Kazimain municipality to be cancelled, or at least direct the municipality to allow the owner an opportunity of doing the replastering and other superficial repairs which are possibly required. In case the municipality persist in their intention it is possible that a claim for damages may arise.

Your Excellency is probably aware that demolitions of house property are in progress at Kerbala, and that the properties of British Indian subjects are in some cases likely to be affected. I have the honour to request that your Excellency will kindly take steps to ensure that the Turkish laws of buildings and expropriation are observed by the Kerbala municipality, as I am informed that there appears to be a tendency on the part of that body to disregard them.

Enclosure 7 in No. 61.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Bagdad.

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, September* 17, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to refer to my letter of the 15th September, 1910, and should be much obliged if your Excellency will kindly inform me at your earliest convenience what steps you propose to take in the matter.

Enclosure 8 in No 61.

The Vali of Baqdad to Consul-General Lorimer.

M. le Consul général, *Baqdad, le 4 (17) septembre*, 1910.

EN réponse à votre lettre du 15 septembre, j'ai l'honneur de vous informer que les travaux de voiries entrepris partout dans ce vilayet se fait conformément aux règlements municipaux et sur l'avis de l'ingénieur ou architecte attaché à chaque municipalité.

Il m'est particulièrement pénible d'être dans l'obligation de vous faire remarquer que le fait d'avoir envoyé des représentants de votre consulat général contrôler l'expertise faite par une municipalité constitue un acte d'immixtion officielle dans nos affaires immobilières, acte que je considère contraire à la loi du 13 safar, 1284.

Si vos ressortissants—qui sont directement justiciables article 2, paragraphe 3) des tribunaux ottomans—ont quelques réclamations à formuler, ou s'ils avaient éventuellement des dommages et intérêts à réclamer, ils doivent s'adresser directement aux autorités judiciaires ou municipales, au même titre et dans les mêmes conditions que les sujets ottomans.

C'est là une question de principe très important, ne tolérant aucune sorte d'exception et sur lequel il ne m'est pas possible de transiger, malgré les meilleurs sentiments dont je suis animés envers votre consulat général.

Veuillez agréer, &c.
Le Gouverneur général,
Commandant de la VI Armée,
H. NAZIM.

Enclosure 9 in No. 61.

Consul-General Lorimer to the Vali of Baqdad.

Your Excellency, *Baqdad, September* 20, 1910.

IN conformity with an indication contained in your Excellency's letter of the 17th September, 1910, the British Indian owner of the house at Kazimain will present a petition on the subject of the threatened demolition of his property to the president of the Kazimain municipality. A copy of his petition is enclosed for your Excellency's information.

As your Excellency declines to discuss the merits of the case with me, and even the question whether an order to execute repairs might not be substituted for the order to demolish, I can do no more.

Your Excellency must not therefore blame me, if the matter reappears later in another form.

Enclosure 10 in No. 61.

Copy of a Petition, dated the 20th September, 1910, *from Seyyid Ali Khan to the President of the Kazimain Municipality.*

Sir,

I HAVE received a verbal notice from the Kazimain municipality ordering me to demolish an arch and upper storey belonging to my house there, on an allegation that they are dangerous.

With reference to this notice I beg to point out that the building in question is not dangerous, as an impartial inspection will prove; and that, at the most, some surface plastering and pointing are required.

I therefore request that you will kindly arrange for the order of demolition to be withdrawn, in which case I will proceed to make any repairs that may appear desirable.

[39464] No. 62.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 31.)

(No. 769.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 25, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 732, of the 14th instant, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah, giving further details, supplied by His Majesty's Acting Consul at Mohammerah, as to the case of piracy already reported.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 62.

Consul Crow to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 57.)

Sir, *Bussorah, September* 28, 1910.

WITH reference to the piratical attack on a Koweit sailing vessel reported in my despatch No. 53, of the 15th September last, I have the honour to transmit copy of a letter from Lieutenant A. T. Wilson, His Majesty's Acting Consul at Mohammerah, giving further details of this and two other piracy cases, which are said to have occurred on the 13th February and 7th March last.

Captain Shakespear, the Political Agent at Koweit, in a letter to me No. 548 of the 14th September last, reported that "two of the pirates connected with the piracy committed on the boom of Salih-bin-Hajri were arrested in Koweit on the 18th August. One of these has turned informer and has given all details of the case. It is said the pirates all belong to villages near Dawasir on the Shatt-el Arab, and are subjects of the Sheikh of Mohammerah. Sheikh Mubarak has despatched two boats to bring the remaining men."

Information regarding the authors of piracies in these districts is invariably conflicting, and the inhabitants of either side the river always try to throw the responsibility on their neighbours of the opposite side. If the Turkish authorities are anxious to prove that the pirates come from Persia, the Persian authorities are equally fervent in their desire to prove that they come from Turkey. As the riverain Arabs on both sides have been addicted to piracy *ab antiquo*, it is difficult to know whom to believe when it comes to a question of the credibility of their evidence. The Sheikh of Mohammerah's soreness in the matter is easily understood. Perhaps the retirement of the vali from Bussorah may serve as balm to his feelings, and may lead to a better *entente* with his successor in prosecuting a search for the "incorrigibles," who still cling to the piratical habits of their forefathers.

I have, &c.
F. E. CROW.

Enclosure 2 in No. 62.

Acting Consul Wilson to Consul Crow.

My dear Crow, *Mohammerah, September* 20, 1910.

YOUR letter of the 8th regarding piracies, asking for details, as you can get no information in Bussorah on these matters. I regret that press of work has prevented an earlier answer.

The following piracies are on record in this office:—

February 13.—Nakhuda Kal Mohammed-bin-Abul Hassan, of Bushire, a Persian subject, was pirated on the bar. No details of actual pirates sufficient to enable them to be identified were available. Loss about 500 rupees.

March 7.—Nakhuda Jama-bin Sulaiman, owner of boat "Saiyid Hasan-bin-Sayid Hussain," of Bandar Rig. Loss about 10,000 krans, including 600 tomans cash.

Pirates recognised and identified by sheikh's representative at Kasbat-al-Nassar. Three of them reported to be refugee sheikhs of Kasbat-al-Nassar who live at Koweit. They were at once surrendered on demand to the Sheikh of Mohammerah by Mubarak, and imprisoned. The remainder came from Maamar-ud-Daura, near Fao on the Turkish side. Application was made to the vali in the matter by the sheikh. A list

giving the names of them all was also furnished to the vali. He sent down police who, according to my information, were told by the headman of Daura, one Bin Naghaim, a Turkish subject, that he would consent to no enquiry or search, and if any attempt to do so were made it would be resisted by force. The Turkish police went away without doing anything.

The vali a few days after wrote to the sheikh that, after careful enquiry, it had been found that the persons mentioned in his list were not guilty of complicity in the piracy, and that Bin Naghaim had furthermore expressed his willingness to point out the real culprits, who lived in Mohammerah. Sheikh Khazal replied asking for Bin Naghaim to be sent for to Bussorah, where he might make good his words.

He has heard no more about it since, as Bin Naghaim is not the least likely to come to Bussorah. Pirates, moreover, do not choose Mohammerah as their residence.

I may add that the information regarding the guilt of men in Daura was quite independently obtained by Shakespear from Mubarak, who said that one of his men had witnessed the division of the spoils.

The vali has done nothing whatever to arrest or make enquiry into this matter, though asked to do so more than once. Apparently he has been fooled in this case, as in the Zain case, by his police. In the Zain case they made him believe his authority as being flouted. In this case, when it is openly defied, they assure him that "careful enquiry" has been made, &c.

The third piracy on record is that of the 29th June.

A Koweit boom, Nakhuda Salih-al-Hajri. The whole crew were murdered, eight men in all, the boom looted and scuttled. This took place on the high seas south of Koweit. The pirates were nine in number. All came from Satiyah, or Kat'ah, in the Dawasir district, Turkish territory, except one man of Kasbat-al-Nassar, who has been arrested and imprisoned by the sheikh. The vali was asked by Sheikh Khazal unofficially to arrest the men in Dawasir, of whom the sheikh showed a list. I am informed the vali declined to take any steps in the matter owing to the lack of legal proof, or some excuse of the sort. He, however, claimed that the man arrested by the sheikh in Kasbat-al-Nassar was a Turkish subject, and wanted Sheikh-al-Khazal to release him; which he very properly declined to do. The man's father and mother are living in Kasbat-al-Nassar, and he is, I have no doubt, a Persian subject.

As regards concerted measures for the prevention of piracy, the vali and the sheikh have made some arrangement for patrolling the river with bellams containing representatives of either side, but the vali's attitude in the proved cases of piracy which have been referred to him has been so disappointing, doubtless on account of his political obsessions, that the sheikh is not very hopeful as to the result of concerted action. I am inclined to share the sheikh's pessimism. The pirates are well aware that their names are known to the Turks. They see that no action of any kind is being taken against them by the vali, though anyone who happens to be a Persian subject has been promptly arrested. They will no doubt become bolder later on.

Yours sincerely,

A. T. WILSON.

[39465] No. 63.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 31.)

(No. 770.)

Sir *Constantinople, October* 23, 1910.

IN accordance with the instructions contained in your despatch No. 314 of the 18th instant, I am requesting His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad to furnish me with a detailed valuation of the damage inflicted on British subjects at Bagdad, Kerbela, Kazimia, and any other places within his district, in consequence of the demolition of their property and expropriation of their lands by the local authorities.

It will no doubt be some time before Mr. Lorimer is able to furnish me with this detailed valuation, for, as he states in his despatch No. 776 of the 5th September last (forming the enclosure to my despatch No. 725 of the 12th instant), it will necessarily depend on the further action taken by the local authorities in connection with the construction of their road, &c., whether the estimated loss to British subjects of some £T. 4,835, for which a claim has already been put in (see my despatch No. 718 of the 10th instant), will be realised or surpassed.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

[39472] No. 64.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received October 31.)

(No. 777.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 26, 1910.

IN my telegram No. 231 of the 24th October, I had the honour to report on the anti-British outbreak produced in Young Turkey circles by the first distorted accounts of the action contemplated by His Majesty's Government to ensure the safety of the Bushire-Ispahan road. The native press, headed by the "Jeune Turc," began to declaim against this betrayal by Russia and England of an Islamic country, and on the 23rd instant the local Persians, supported by the Mujtehid of Nejf, Sheikh Escadoullah, and some prominent Young Turks, organised in a local theatre a meeting of protest, at which some violent anti-British and anti-Triple *Entente* oratory was indulged in, and it was decided to send a telegram to the German Emperor to come to the aid of Persia and Islam on the lines of His Majesty's intervention in Morocco. Under the state of siège no meeting can be held in the capital without the sanction of the authorities, and the present demonstration was arranged with the help of the Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asiatic wing of the Committee. Some of the most uncompromising exponents of these doctrines were on the platform, and in their utterances completely ignored the principle of "Ottomanism." Speeches were delivered by Naji Bey, one of the three official representatives of the Committee, and by a prominent Committee deputy, Obeidullah Effendi, who has travelled in France, England, and America, and speaks English, but has recently been converted to the Pan-Asiatic cause. His contribution was the most violent and the most successful of the evening. Speaking of "the Christian civilisation of the twentieth century so much vaunted by Westerns," he declared that he had visited and studied western countries and found that they had lapsed from and neglected or despised the teachings of Christ; that their civilisation was but the resultant decadence, and that in arrogating the right to style the present age "the twentieth century" they forgot that for the Moslem world it was only the fourteenth century (1328 A.H.), and that Moslems had not yet become degenerate. He proved, apparently to his own satisfaction and to that of the House, which was crowded, that Russia, France, and England had profited most by the temporary lethargy of Islam, had absorbed or controlled the greater part of the lands of Islam, and were the insidious enemies of the Moslem States which still exist, while Germany, Austria, and Italy were practically innocent of encroachment on Islam. He stated that certain foreigners decried Germany and her enterprises in Turkey, *e.g.*, the Bagdad Railway, but that an impartial analysis of these people's criticisms would show that they were actuated purely by bias and jealousy of Germany, and were endeavouring to exploit the ignorant credulity of Turks, whereas German enterprises were more thoroughly and efficiently run than those of their rival foreigners. Germany, he said, was the predominant partner in the Triple Alliance, and her Emperor had championed the cause of downtrodden Moslems. Hence he proposed the telegraphic appeal, from which it is hoped more tangible results will be forthcoming than on the occasion of the Emperor's appearance at Tangier, and his speech at Saladin's tomb at Damascus at the moment when Turkish troops were expelled from Crete. It remains to be seen how His Majesty will acknowledge this flattering appeal to his chivalrous instincts. It is not impossible that the Germans may secretly urge the Turks to make a counter-demonstration by sending more troops to Kermanshah or Saoujbulak, or by offering to police the Khanikin-Kermanshah road. It was noticed that numbers of Turkish officers attended the meeting, and were loudest in their applause of Germany. The Minister of the Interior and other prominent Young Turks have privately expressed their disapproval of the proceedings, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs spoke to me apologetically about it, but, under a Government such as Turkey now enjoys, the moderate and thinking elements are frequently at a discount. When pro-British and pro-French demonstrations took place in July 1908, some shrewd observers remarked that if the German-trained military and the Chauvinist elements got the upper hand, the Cretan question, &c., would in a not distant future be easily exploited to bring about a revulsion in favour of Germany and Austria. The recent events in Persia and the soreness felt at the failure to raise the loan in France have accentuated this result. If we are able to give the Turks some satisfaction in Crete on the lines set forth in my despatch No. 722 of the 11th October, and the Austro-German banks fail to give Turkey the financial assistance she expects now and in the not distant future, the apparent popularity of the Central European Powers may not be very long-lived.

I have had the correct version of the Bushire–Ispahan road circulated in the press and otherwise, and already there are signs of a subsidence in the anti-British hysterical outburst, while the loan failure has caused many secret misgivings and sobered searchings of heart. The bulk of public opinion and feeling are distressed at the rupture with France and at any anti-British demonstration, while being averse to "travailler pour le Roi de Prusse," but it is a moot question whether, under the new régime and its state of siege, the sentiments of the majority count more than under the old rule of Yildiz.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

[39789] No. 65.

The Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to Foreign Office.—(Received November 1.)

3, Salter's Hall Court, Cannon Street, London, October 31, 1910.

Sir,

WITH reference to our letter of the 13th instant on the subject of the navigation of the rivers of Mesopotamia, I have the honour to inform you that our agents abroad telegraph to us that there is a serious congestion at Bussorah of cargo destined for Bagdad. They estimate the accumulation at nearly 6,000 tons, of which 2,750 tons is in our hands. At the present time time we could transfer a steamer temporarily to the Tigris from our Karun service, and our reserve steamer at Bussorah is also available, save that it will have to replace one of our three service steamers on the Tigris for two or three weeks during repair of damaged machinery. I am instructed by my board to request that this situation may receive the careful consideration of His Majesty's Government, with a view to its early relief.

A point I venture to present for your consideration in this connection is that when the Turkish steamers are unable for a period, as in this instance, to deal with the usual quantity of mercantile cargo, or are unable to cope with an expanding trade, the British company is debarred from relieving the situation, although five-sixths of the consequent loss and inconvenience falls on British commerce.

Further, our position is hard, in that we undergo the expense of maintaining a fleet sufficient to cope with accidents and fluctuations of trade, but are not allowed to make full use of it at times like the present, when a congestion of traffic can be pointed to as a reason for railway facilities, or for fresh navigation concessions, hostile to ourselves.

I have, &c.
H. W. MACLEAN, *Secretary.*

[39828] No. 66.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 1.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Viscount Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 31st October, relative to the Sheikh of Koweit and the Vali of Bussorah.

India Office, November 1, 1910.

Enclosure in No. 66.

Government of India to Viscount Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P. [*Received October 31, 1910.*]

REPORT received from Resident, Persian Gulf, states that a letter was addressed to Sheikh of Koweit on 11th instant by the new Vali of Bussorah, asking how sheikh would like to receive a sum of £T.400 per annum which had been prescribed for him as kaimakam by the Turkish Government. After consulting Colonel Cox, the sheikh declined the offer.

[40423] No. 67.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 7.)

(No. 781.)

Sir,

Constantinople, October 30, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Erzeroum reporting a speech by Vartkess Effendi, Member of Parliament for Erzeroum, in which he advocated the maintenance of good relations with England and France.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 67.

Consul MacGregor to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 83.)

Sir,

Erzeroum, October 18, 1910.

THE Armenian deputy for Erzeroum, Vartkess Effendi, who has been spending the vacation here, addressed a representative meeting in the Government House a couple of days ago on the eve of his departure, and in the course of his speech made some remarks which may not be devoid of interest at this moment, as the speaker, while professing a crude variety of socialism, seems to be a man of some sense and courage.

I should first of all state that the failure of the Government to fulfil its promises to build roads and solve the agrarian problem during the past summer has caused much discontent among all classes of the population, and that this discontent found public expression in so marked a form on the occasion of a religious ceremony held the other day to commemorate the soldiers who fell during the Russo-Turkish war that the vali telegraphed his resignation to Constantinople. This is not the first time that his Excellency has offered to resign; but on this occasion the local Union and Progress Committee is said to have forbidden the telegraph office to transmit his despatch.

Vartkess Effendi endeavoured to impress on his audience—which included the vali—that, if the Government had not succeeded in carrying out its programme, the reason was to be found in the unforeseen difficulties with which it had had to cope in other provinces of the Empire, difficulties which had not only absorbed all the attention of the Ministers, but had also entailed a heavy drain on the Treasury.

He then proceeded to warn his hearers against listening to any suggestion of abandoning their attitude of confidence in the two Powers which alone had, by sympathy and example, held out a helping hand to Turkey in her aspirations towards better things, viz., Great Britain and France. It was true that at this moment neither of these two Powers appeared so ready as was expected in some quarters to lend the Government money; but they must recollect that Turkey was handicapped by her past, and this was not the moment to abandon tried friendships, least of all when the alternative was to make advances to Austria and Germany, the Power which had with such cynical selfishness exploited the old despotic régime to the lasting prejudice of the Ottoman State.

This pronouncement on the part of Vartkess Effendi, who laid stress on the fact that his opinions were based exclusively on Ottoman patriotism, has aroused public attention here, coinciding as it does with the departure of the Young Turk leaders for the congress at Salonica, and, as it may conceivably be the prelude to a reaction against the supremacy of the committee, I have thought it worth while to bring it to your Excellency's notice.

I may add that, although Vartkess Effendi was prodigal in assurances that next session would be fruitful in useful legislation, he told me some time ago that he expected little else than a period of wrangling between the representatives of the various nationalities.

I have, &c.
P. J. C. MACGREGOR.

[40430] No. 68.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 7.)

(No. 788.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October 31, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 768 of the 25th, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, reporting on the further demolitions which are taking place there.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 68.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 860.)

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, September 27, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to report, in continuation of my despatch No. 850 of the 21st September, that the demolition of Seyyid Ali Khan's arch and upper storey at Kadhimain has been commenced, and will no doubt be completed.

The vali's political secretary called on me to-day and conversed with me on the subject, and I understood him to say that the policy of condemning buildings as dangerous and demolishing them without compensation instead of expropriating the owners had been deliberately adopted by the vilayet as the most inexpensive method of carrying out necessary municipal improvements. He stated, so far as I could follow him, that £ T. 20,000 had already been saved by resorting to this expedient in the case of buildings owned by Turkish subjects, and he said that the object of the vilayet in negotiating with Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co., as they are now doing, with reference to a law-suit threatened by that firm was to avoid, if possible, the establishment of a precedent which might encourage Turkish subjects to claim compensation under the expropriation laws. I understand, however, that Messrs. Lynch are most unlikely to agree to any settlement which does not include pecuniary compensation. I told the political secretary that in any case in which the owner, being a British subject, was willing to settle direct with the vilayet I should have no objection at all, but that, where he was not willing, and sought my assistance, I could not but support his just claims. It will, I think, be admitted that it is impossible to allow British subjects to be robbed of their property by artifice merely in order to facilitate the spoliation of Ottoman subjects by their own Government.

From M. Eram Bey's remarks on this occasion I can only conclude that, sooner or later, it will be necessary to decide, in all the cases mentioned in my despatch No. 776 of the 5th September, 1910, how the claims to compensation of the British subjects affected are to be enforced. There is not the slightest use in my continuing to press the matter here, and I therefore solicit the favour of your Excellency's taking such action at Constantinople as may seem to your Excellency to be proper and sufficient.

I may add that the question of a new main street and three cross streets in Bagdad town, which has been mentioned more than once in my monthly summaries of events, is expected to enter on the practical stage shortly after the conclusion of the Ramadhan. The municipal engineer (M. Chavanis, a French subject) informs me that the main street, 20 metres wide, will be made by cutting through the solid town for a distance of 3 kilom., and that 480 houses, none of them fortunately belonging to British subjects, will be destroyed in whole or in part. From another source I learn that the alignment of this projected street has been altered lately so as to carry it through the poorer quarters, where the proprietors are less able to offer opposition. If the money-saving principle indicated by M. Eram Bey is adopted in the case of this street to any great extent, I anticipate that, notwithstanding the poverty of the owners, the vilayet may encounter some difficulties.

I would beg your Excellency to regard my conversations with the political secretary and the municipal engineer as confidential.

I have, &c.

J. G. LORIMER, *I.C.S.*,

Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

[40432] No. 69.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 7.)

(No. 790.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October 30, 1910.*

THERE is little news of importance to report to you from the Anatolian provinces of the Ottoman Empire since the date of my last despatch No. 669 of the 20th ultimo. From most of these provinces I have received no further news, from which I conclude that the month of Ramazan has brought with it the usual period of lethargy and stagnation. The province of Van would appear from the enclosed quarterly report recently received from Captain Seel to be suffering in particular from this condition of stagnation, and no progress seems to have been made with the education question, although the vali has settled some of the land disputes between Kurdish occupants and Armenian owners, to the satisfaction of the latter.

The vali, Captain Seel informs me, is none the less unpopular with the Ramgavar (constitutional democratic) Armenians, because he is said to favour the Tashnakist revolutionaries; with the Committee of Union and Progress party, because he will not allow their interference or listen to their advice; and with the Young Turks generally, because he removes them from the administrative offices and replaces them by Circassians. His Excellency has only lately revived the hostility of the Armenians against him by refusing to regard as an act of terrorism the recent murder of one of these Armenians by a member of the opposite faction. His Excellency's enemies among the Turkish and Armenian notables have now joined forces against him, and have addressed a letter of protest to the Minister of the Interior in which they beg for his recall.

In the province of Bitlis there has been a change of governors: the vali, Tahir Pasha, who had most injudiciously spoilt and encouraged the Kurds and shown great weakness and lack of administrative ability, having now been moved to Mosul and replaced by the acting vali, Ismail Hakki Bey, who, it is hoped, with the support of the younger military element in the province and in the capital as well, will do much to purge the country of its crop of criminals, agitators, and robbers and to introduce a purer and more efficient administration. Up to the present, however, the provincial administration of the Empire has suffered almost as much from the constant change of valis in each province as from the innate difficulties arising out of local conditions.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 69.

Vice-Consul Molyneux-Seel to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 24.)

Sir, *Van, September 30, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Excellency a quarterly report on the affairs of the vilayet.

As far as I am able to draw a comparison of the present state of affairs with that existing at the end of the preceding three months before my arrival here, the general situation appears to have undergone very little change.

This stagnation, however, has aroused a growing feeling of discontent among a considerable section of the Van population, which finds expression in complaints and accusations against the vali of this vilayet. In my despatch No. 21 I enumerated the principal causes of complaint. In addition to those the dismissal of the kaimakam of Shattakh, who was an official highly esteemed by Turks and Armenians alike, and the dispatch of some fourteen ex-revolutionist Armenians (who offered their services) for the capture of Said Bey have aroused additional ill-feeling against the vali.

This latter action on the part of the vali was undoubtedly most unwise. Said Bey is a Kurd who took up outlawry as a profession on being dispossessed of certain Armenian lands which he held, and who confines his enmity, as far as homicide is concerned, to the vali personally and to those sent to capture him. Up to the present he has never committed acts of brigandage against Armenians, and the latter now naturally fear that, as the result of this band of Armenians being sent against him, he will, by way of revenge, turn his attentions to them.

The possibility of Said Bey's capture is hardly considered, but should this be

achieved, the effect would probably be to greatly incense the Kurds against the Armenians.

General Handi Pasha, of the General Staff, and commanding the gendarmerie, recently visited Van for a few days. He spoke quite openly about this affair, and said that should the Armenians capture Said Bey we might expect, without doubt, a massacre of Armenians at Van. Personally, I consider this an exaggerated view prompted mainly by the desire to show up in as bad a light as possible the conduct of the vali, with whom he is not on the best of terms.

The officials here are fully alive to the importance of the establishment of schools in the villages throughout the vilayet, especially in the Kurd villages, and rightly regard the education of the Kurds as the true solution of the problem of making them submissive to law and order, and awakening among them a desire for a higher scale of civilisation. But owing to lack of funds there seems no prospect of such schools being established in the near future.

A school for the training of schoolmasters has been opened here. Those who pass through it are exempted from military service.

The Armenian Lands.—Although the restoration of Armenian lands seized by Kurds has not by any means been completed, still a good deal has been done in the way of settlement, and the Armenians are as a whole content with the decisions made by the vali during his tour north of Lake Van last June. Hussein Pasha still remains at Adeljivas, in possession of the Armenian lands in that neighbourhood, as the sum which it was decided should be paid to him is not yet forthcoming. In Van itself no discontent among the Armenians is manifest. They are entirely absorbed in their own party politics, and the feeling between Armenists and Taschnakists is very strong. This has been greatly accentuated by the recent murder of Manouk by the Taschnakist David (according to the Armenist account), which the Armenists consider an act of terrorism.

The Kurds.—There are no signs of abnormal unrest among the Kurds at present, and although acts of brigandage have not been infrequent, these can only be regarded as such, and not as evidences of race hatred.

The brigandage and robbery that exists is confined to three or four outlaws and their companions. Said Bey has been particularly active of late, though it is doubtful if he has really been the author of all the acts ascribed to him, as any enterprising Kurd may come down during the night and steal a few horses from a village and be sure that the robbery will be attributed to Said Bey.

The troops returning from Shattakh brought with them a brigand named Rashid Agha, uncle of the famous Mir Méhé. This man had rendered unsafe for some time past the road between Van and Shattakh. Needless to say, he was not captured by the soldiers, but delivered over by his own friends.

All efforts at capturing Said Bey, Mir Méhé, and Jaffar have so far been unavailing, and this has been the cause of much discontent among the population of Van. The task, however, is a very difficult one. The gendarmes are for the most part too old for the work, badly officered, and animated with no very keen desire to carry out their task, and the soldiers are little better. They are unacquainted even with the country. On the other hand, these outlaws are intimately acquainted with the country, and have the free use of Armenian villages, as well as their own, for their subsistence, the villagers being quite powerless to refuse hospitality to twelve or fifteen armed men, and equally afraid to report the arrival to the authorities for fear of the inevitable revenge that would overtake them. In a country where one man will betray his dearest friend for a few piastres, it seems strange that the Government have not yet essayed the effect of offering a substantial reward for the capture of these celebrities.

The Tyari have paid their taxes, or, rather, they offered no resistance to the soldiers, who seized 2,500 sheep and sold them at half market price to realise the amount due. From accounts I have received, the troops committed all kinds of excesses whilst carrying out their task.

The policy of the Government with regard to the Nestorians is to destroy the temporal authority of Mar Shimun and to bring the tribesmen more directly under the control of the local government officials. In principle this policy appears to be justified, but unfortunately the Tyari have been given cause for complaint in that no efforts have been made to similarly break the authority of the neighbouring sheikhs.

The Persian Frontier.—The state of affairs in the "new territories" is undoubtedly bad. Travellers from Urmi characterise the state of affairs in the Urmi plain as that of anarchy—entire absence of law and order. The villages in this fertile plain are said to be poverty-stricken, owing to the oppression of the Kurd Aghas, and the villagers in

the vicinity of Urmi do not know to which authority to turn in the existing conditions. The kaïmakam of Ushnu, Captain Husni Bey, has resigned his post and returned to Van. He gives a bad account of the state of affairs in his district. The Kurds in that district are very turbulent, and he appears to have been continually occupied with repressive measures. His resignation was due to his disgust at the inefficiency of the troops and gendarmes which prevented him from coping successfully with the Kurds.

He has been replaced by a Circassian, the brother-in-law of the vali, Islam Bey, who will receive a monthly salary of 1,000 piasters in addition to his salary as First Commissary of Police. The kaïmakam of Chari is also here on leave. He gives a favourable account of affairs in his district. It appears that, with a view to gaining the sympathy of the inhabitants, no taxes of any kind are being levied in these frontier districts.

A civil kaïmakam (also a Circassian) has been appointed to Mawana, up till now the seat of a mudir only.

The strength of the garrison on the frontier furnished by this Ordu has been increased by one battalion as already reported to your Excellency. Forty of the newly-arrived Christian soldiers have also been drafted into the regiments on the frontier.

It is possible that the 4th battalion 30th Regiment is also now on the frontier in Solduz. This regiment left Van for Chal with the object of punishing certain tribes who had given assistance to the outlawed Sheikh of Bazani. On its arrival, however, it was found that the said sheikh had been installed as kaïmakam of Akra. The tribes were therefore forgiven, and the regiment sent on to Rowanduz. I have no information as to whether it is still there or not.

Military News.—The calling to the colours of Christians of this vilayet has begun. They will be sent to Constantinople.

Commercial News.—The small Government steamer which has lain here so long idle has at length been launched, and has made several successful trial trips. It is hoped that a regular service will soon be inaugurated.

A company has been formed for the purchase of three steamers to ply on Lake Van between the towns of Arjish, Adeljivas, Akhlat, Tadvan (port of Bitlis) and Van. The capital is to be £T. 10,000 in 5*l.* shares. The shares will be offered for subscription after the Ramazan, and will be readily taken up. The Sheikh of Shandinan has engaged himself to take 230 shares. The readiness of the people to participate in this enterprise, which implies confidence in the belief that the profits will, in fact, reach the pockets of the shareholders, must be regarded as a good sign.

Two engineers have been sent here from Constantinople, at the instance of the Armenian deputy for Van, for the purpose of drawing up projects for (1) the irrigation of Van district by canalisation from Lake Archag, and (2) the connecting of Lake Van and the River Tigris somewhere below Sert by a navigable canal.

The first scheme is based on the assumption that the water during its passage from Lake Archag to this neighbourhood, 15 miles, will lose its saline properties. The second scheme is a proposition so obviously impracticable that it could never have been seriously contemplated.

Neither of these two (so-called) engineers have had any training as such, nor possess any knowledge whatever of engineering. One of them was in days past a well-know Van "tedai." They have come here then solely on the strength of being protégés of the Armenian Taschnakist Deputy; the Turkish Minister having acceded to the request as a sign of good-will towards the Taschnakist party. That, at any rate, is the reason accepted here. Needless to mention that these "engineers" are in receipt of high salaries.

Another project mooted by the Armenian deputy is the electric lighting of Van by water-power from the Shemiram Su, but the making of roads seems to be a matter unworthy of consideration.

I have been informed, and I believe the information to be trustworthy, that there are two German agents here, influential Armenians, who receive 12*l.* a month for the service of gaining the good-will of the Armenians, and preparing the way for German commerce in these parts.

I have, &c.

L. MOLYNEUX-SEEL, *Captain.*

[40435] No. 70.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 7.)

(No. 793.)

Sir, *Constantinople, November 2, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 667 of the 20th September, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from Mr. Matthews, His Majesty's vice-consul at Diarbekir concerning the land question in that vilayet.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 70.

Vice-Consul Matthews to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 50.)

Sir, *Diarbekir, October 19, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to report for your Excellency information that the two civil inspectors, Ali Snidi Effendi and Staff-Major Mustafa Bey, referred to in my despatch No. 41 of the 5th ultimo, in connection with the land question in the vilayet of Mamouret-ul-Aziz, arrived here about the middle of September, and, after a stay of a few days, paid a flying visit to Mardin, after which they proceeded to Aleppo by way of Siverek and Urfa. Their arrival here, and the object of their visit were not generally known, until they were about to take their departure, and it is complained that their activity was confined to interviewing local officials. The impression has been created locally, that this inspection is not intended by the central Government to be followed by any rectification of the numerous agrarian abuses existing in this vilayet.

I am informed that cases of wrongful seizure and occupation of lands are most numerous in the cazas of Bisheri, Silivan, and Palu, and in the mudirlik of Arghani. I transmit to your Excellency herewith a translation of a statement on the land question in this vilayet, sent by the local Armenian bishop to the Patriarchate at Constantinople.

The following cases, which have come to my knowledge, are typical and well authenticated:—

Some thirty years ago certain Armenians of Arghani were dispossessed of their three villages: Kiuchuk Keuy, seized by a Kurd named Nuri Bey; Kolar Keuy, seized by Kurds under the protection of Nuri Bey; and Uzun Ova Keuy, seized by Sidki Pasha, Derbaz Oghlu, and Koshkanian. Although the rightful owners have the title-deeds of these villages, they have been unable to obtain possession.

After the events of 1895, twelve Armenians of the village of Bashnik, in the caza of Silivan, pledged their lands to the late Seveddin Pasha and his cousin, Bedri Bey, in return for the restitution of looted property. In 1899 the legal formalities for the transfer of these lands to the names of Seveddin Pasha and Bedri Bey were carried out, notwithstanding the opposition of the owners. These lands are now occupied by Bedri Bey, and the sons of the late Seveddin Pasha. In addition, the gardens adjoining Bashnik village, to which Bedri Bey and the sons of Seveddin Pasha have no shadow of a legal claim, are at present occupied by their followers.

Although some land cases have, to my knowledge, been settled directly by the vali as an administrative measure ("idaretan"), the general policy of the Government has been to refer complainants to the local courts, which are as a rule incompetent and unwilling to deal with such cases.

I have, &c.

W. D. W. MATTHEWS.

Enclosure 2 in No. 70.

Statement made by the Acting Armenian Bishop of Diarbekir to the Patriarch at Constantinople.

(Translation.) *Diarbekir, June 16 (29), 1910.*

The lands which have been unjusty seized in the cazas of Silivan, Bisheri, and Diarbekir may be classified as follows:—

1. Lands which are registered in the names of Armenians and the owners of which are alive, but which are occupied by the oppressors.

2. Lands which are registered in the names of Armenians, but for which the oppressors have also taken out title-deeds, by bribing the officials of the Land Registry Office, and asserting that they were the rightful owners on the ground of "hak-i-karar."

3. Lands which have been registered in the names of the oppressors on the presentation of false certificates ("ilmou-haber") to establish their claim to title by "hak-i-karar."

4. Lands which have been registered in the names of Armenians, whose names have subsequently been erased from the local registers, the names of the oppressors being substituted, and false title-deeds being issued.

5. Lands which have been transferred to the oppressors, without the knowledge of the rightful owners, in whose names false declarations have been made respecting fictitious sales.

6. Lands which have been transferred to the oppressors within the year following the death of the owners, by false declarations to the officials of the Land Registry Office.

7. Lands which have been transferred to the oppressors by the owners, in consequence of threats and in fear of violence.

ZAVEN D. YEGHIAIAN, *Vartabed.*

I venture to add the following explanations to the preceding:—

Note 1.—The "oppressors" are as a general rule Kurdish beys and aghas.

Note 2.—"Hak-i-karar" ("droit de permanance") gives a valid title to State lands ("orazi-i-mirié"), if the claimant shows that he has cultivated and occupied the land claimed for a period of ten years. The official of the Land Registry Office is obliged to deliver him a title-deed gratis.

I am informed that the application of the land code of 1868 was not extended to this vilayet until 1872, and did not become general until 1878. It is stated that even to-day many of the lands in the neighbourhood of Lijeh are unregistered.

W. D. W. MATTHEWS.

[40437] No. 71.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 7.)

(No. 795.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October 31, 1910.*

I TOOK another opportunity to-day of urging upon Rifaat Pasha the necessity of settling without further delay some of the cases of obvious illegality of which British subjects had recently been victims, and which I had over and over again brought to his notice. These, and questions in the Persian Gulf which were clear attempts to infringe the *status quo*, had cumulatively produced a very bad impression, not only on the British public, but on His Majesty's Government, and his Excellency's promises of a settlement of them were very tardy in their realisation.

Rifaat Pasha declared that all the matters that I had brought to his notice were being dealt with, and in most of them satisfaction had been given. There seemed, his Excellency said, to have arisen an idea in our minds that Great Britain and her subjects had been specially singled out for the irregularities of the nature complained of. This was far from being the case, and he hoped I would be convinced that it was the earnest desire of the Ottoman Government to remain on the best of terms with His Majesty's Government. If foreigners had suffered, they had suffered equally. This must be accounted for by the fact that internal matters had too fully occupied the attention of the Government, that the country was passing in many respects through an experimental stage since the new régime, and that, from the point of view of experience and discipline, the officials who had been recently appointed in the provinces had not in all cases proved to be a success.

His Excellency went on to say that it was with great regret that they saw that the "Times" had recently adopted a less sympathetic attitude than formerly towards "Young Turkey." The views of the "Times" correspondent at Athens were invariably adopted, and the point of view of Turkey in the Greek question was ignored. Further, in the recent matter of the loan the "Times" had declared that the conditions

imposed by France were fair and acceptable, whereas it was clear that the foreign control which they implied could never be accepted by any Government here, and public opinion in England seemed now to resent the fact that Turkey had applied to Germany for a loan, where no alternative was open to her.

I said that this embassy had felt very acutely the difficulty in the settlement of cases concerning their subjects where they were obviously in the right, as we were even more careful than others to investigate very thoroughly every case before it was represented to the Sublime Porte, and were always ready to help in finding a solution that would be agreeable to both parties, while not insisting in too uncompromising a manner on our strict rights. This his Excellency admitted to be the case.

I then referred again to the cases of illegal demolition of British property at Bagdad, which I said demanded a prompt settlement. His Excellency replied that he had quite recently again sent instructions to Bagdad to the vali to be careful in dealing with British subjects and interests, and to endeavour to settle the matter equitably.

I am confidentially informed that Tewfik Pasha, Ottoman Ambassador in London, has recently telegraphed reporting that the failure to conclude the loan with the French has produced an unfavourable echo in England, and urging, if possible, seeking an opportunity of reopening negotiations with Paris. Tewfik also urges prudence and moderation in handling the Persian question, and the necessity of not irritating France and England at the present juncture. The pasha is further reported to have especially counselled putting an end to the attacks and threats against England made by the Young Egyptians and extremists, who demand the evacuation of Egypt, and giving special instructions in this sense to the Ottoman commissioner in Egypt.

The not very satisfactory internal situation and the threatened Ministerial crisis reported in my despatch No. 800 of to-day, taken together with the rupture of the loan negotiations with the French, have not increased the prestige or internal popularity of the Young Turks, who are, for the moment, suffering from the sense of partial failure, a state of mind which may explain to a certain extent the reason for and the nature of Rifaat Pasha's above-quoted statements. The Young Turks are not wont to admit their shortcomings, and invariably look round for scapegoats. At present they are inclined to attribute the wane of their influence in the countries of the Triple *Entente*, not to the bad impression produced by their policy and acts of last year, but to the incompetence of their representatives in London, Paris, and St. Petersburgh, and there are evident signs of their intention to replace them by younger and more "energetic" men. It seems highly problematical whether by such changes they will enhance Turkey's prestige abroad.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

[40439] No. 72.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 7.)

(No. 797.)
Sir, *Pera, October 31, 1910.*

WITH reference to your despatch No. 312 of the 17th instant, and your telegrams Nos. 317 and 323 of the 21st and 26th instant, I have the honour to report that I had already demanded in writing that instructions should be sent to the authorities of Bagdad to indemnify the British subjects for the specified losses incurred by them. I have since informed the Minister of Foreign Affairs that, in virtue of instructions received from His Majesty's Government, I am holding the central Government responsible for the amounts in question. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to see how the local authorities at Bagdad can indemnify the British subjects without laying themselves open to similar claims by Ottoman subjects who have suffered similarly, and it may be easier for the central Government to settle these matters direct with His Majesty's Embassy.

As regards the Sheikh of Koweit's lands at Fadaghia, the information as to details, &c., supplied by His Majesty's officers in those regions differs considerably from that in the lands of the Minister of the Interior, and the latter proposes waiting the arrival in Constantinople of Ahmed Pasha-as-Zohair, who is expected in a few days.

The Minister declares that he has no knowledge of the alleged appointment of mudirs to Wakra and Zobara, and he has telegraphed to Bussorah for information on the subject.

As regards Zakhnuniyeh, I am still awaiting confirmation from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah of the execution of the orders for evacuation.

I have made further representations to the Minister of Foreign Affairs regarding the difficulty of the Smyrna–Aidin Railway Company. The Minister has promised to again speak to his colleague of Public Works on the subject. In the meantime the agent here informs me that the Imperial commissary has visited the line with Mr. Barfield and has reported in favour of the company's claim, and that he is expecting that a satisfactory arrangement will shortly be come to.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

[40443] No. 73.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 7.)

(No. 801.)
Sir, *Pera, November 2, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 777 of the 26th ultimo, reporting the hysterical outbursts caused by the first and exaggerated versions of the contemplated proposals of His Majesty's Government for policing the Bushire–Ispahan road, I have the honour to report that the excitement, which was partly artificial, has now considerably calmed down. I have caused the real facts of the case to be explained to most of the editors of the native press and to some influential members of the committee. Both the latter and the Germans seem now somewhat embarrassed, especially concerning the speech of Obeidullah Effendi and the telegram to the German Emperor. His Majesty's reply was awaited with a certain curiosity, but I am informed from German sources, as also by the Persian chargé d'affaires, that it has not reached its august addressee. I fancy this version is merely intended to explain the absence of the expected reply and action of His Majesty. Another rumour put about by the Germans is that the whole incident was the result of a British intrigue to put the German Emperor in an embarrassing position, and damage German prestige by their unavoidable failure to respond to the appeal.

An important local organ, the "Sabah," has published a couple of historical and reasoned articles on the subject from the pen of an influential Armenian, and it must be remembered that the Armenians have never forgiven William II for his speech at Damascus and his friendly visit to Abdul Hamid shortly after the massacres. One of these articles shows that the Morocco agreement resulting from the Emperor's dramatic visit to Tangier did not obtain for the Moroccans any better terms than those already secured to the Persians by the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907.

It is perhaps noticeable that the Persian Minister in Berlin is about to be transferred to Constantinople, and, as pointed out before, it is not improbable that the Germans may be advising the Young Turks to reply to the British action, should the necessity for the latter arise, by some further advance in West Persia. Such an advance must, however, almost necessarily be confined to the northern or Russian sphere, and it is difficult to see how the Turks are to go beyond the area already under their influence without compromising the existence of Persia. Despatches from Van point to their consolidating their position by the appointment of military officers as kaimakams at Ushnu and Mawana, and four Turkish battalions are said to be scattered through the "annexed" districts. I have reminded the Porte that the status of Kotur was settled by the Treaty of Berlin, and thus became international.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

[40625] No. 74.

Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to Foreign Office.—(Received November 7.)

3, Salter's Hall Court, Cannon Street, London, November 7, 1910.

Sir,

WITH further reference to our letter of the 24th ultimo, I have the honour to inform you that our agent at Bussorah telegraphs to us that the Vali of Bussorah will prevent the use by us of our reserve steamer the P.S. "Blosse Lynch" on the Tigris

in place of the steamer which is to be withdrawn temporarily for repairs. We enclose a copy of the telegram.

You will recollect that on the 12th April last we wrote you regarding rumours that the Vali of Bussorah intended to prevent our new steamer, the T.S.S. "Julnar," from working on the river, and on the 9th May you informed us that His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople reported that the instructions from the Turkish Government to prevent the new steamer from running were due to their mistaken idea that we proposed to keep four steamers on the river. In our letters of the 5th and 13th July we informed you of the intention of the Vali of Bussorah to prevent in future the use of our reserve steamer in place of any one of our other steamers on service on the Tigris, and we begged that His Majesty's Government would see that our rights in this matter are respected.

We have to lay up the T.S.S. "Julnar" immediately owing to an accident to part of her machinery, and shall be obliged if you will communicate by telegraph with His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople in order to secure that telegraphic instructions shall be sent at once by the central authorities in Constantinople to the Vali of Bussorah to permit our reserve steamer the P.S. "Blosse Lynch" to be run in place of the T.S.S. "Julnar," which is going into reserve temporarily for repairs.

We trust that this matter will receive the instant attention of His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, as the Vali of Bussorah will not allow the P.S. "Blosse Lynch" to be substituted for the T.S.S. "Julnar" pending instructions from the central authorities.

I have, &c.
H. W. MACLEAN, *Secretary.*

Enclosure in No. 74.

Copy of telegram from Bussorah, dated November 3, 1910.

THE Vali of Bussorah will not permit substitution of "Blosse Lynch" for "Julnar" pending instructions from the Sublime Porte. "Julnar" is expected to arrive 4th instant. Please hasten as much as possible.

[39398] No. 75.

Foreign Office to Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company.

Sir, *Foreign Office, November 7, 1910.*

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th instant respecting your claim on account of the demolition of a part of your property at Bagdad. I am to state that, as has already been pointed out verbally to one of your directors, His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople has been directed to present a claim in this connection to the Central Turkish Government, and I am to add that Sir G. Lowther has since reported that he will present such a claim as soon as he has received a precise statement of the value of the damage done, which he has requested His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad to forward to him as soon as possible.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[40625] No. 76.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 329.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, November 8, 1910.*

TIGRIS steam-ship service.

Please refer to my despatch No 331 of the 1st November.

According to a telegram received by the company from Bussorah, the vali refuses, until he shall have received instructions to that effect from Constantinople, to allow

reserve steamer to run instead of the "Julnar." The plea that the acquisition of the right to run a third steamer causes the company to forfeit its right to keep a reserve steamer and utilise it if necessary is inadmissible. You are therefore to urge Turkish Government to send at once necessary instructions to the vali.

---

[294] No. 77.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, November 8, 1910.*

WITH reference to my letter, marked immediate, of the 25th January last, I am directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to state, for the information of the Secretary of State for India, that he has had under consideration the second memorandum of the German Government, enclosed in a note dated the 4th December, 1909, from the German Ambassador, on the subject of the cancellation of the red oxide concession at Abu Musa.

Sir E. Grey has always intended to postpone detailed criticism of the German case until after careful local enquiries have been made regarding the new and important evidence now brought forward by the German Government: in view, however, of the fact that the British resident in the Persian Gulf has been unable, as stated in his telegram of the 27th September, to make satisfactory progress in the collection of evidence, and inasmuch as the question of delay cannot fail to have an important bearing upon the amount of compensation which may be payable as damages,—a period of nine months having already elapsed since the date of my letter of the 25th January,—Sir E. Grey considers that it may be expedient to lay before the Earl of Crewe certain observations in regard to a possible settlement of the question in dispute.

Sir E. Grey does not now propose to review the circumstances which led up to the cancellation of the lease by the Sheikh of Shargah; but he considers, for reasons which are fully set forth in printed minutes of which copies were furnished to your department in the month of February last, that His Majesty's Government might safely make an offer to the German Government to give Messrs. Woenckhaus and Co. the same position that they held under their contract of June 1906 commercially, if means can be devised that will safeguard British political interests.

He further considers that Messrs. Woenckhaus' claim is valid in so far as it relates to the loss sustained in consequence of Hassan Sannaiyeh's breach of contract to sell the output of the oxide mines at a fixed price per ton; this breach of contract is due to the cancellation of the concession by the Sheikh of Shargah; and the German Government have apparently full knowledge that the sheikh acted with the approval, and indeed at the instigation of His Majesty's Government.

In these circumstances Sir E. Grey is disposed to think that proposals to the German Government on the following lines might possibly meet the requirements of the situation; but, inasmuch as the Government of India is primarily concerned, more especially in regard to the payment of compensation, these proposals are of course subject to the ultimate decision of Lord Crewe:—

1. The Sheikh of Shargah to grant a new concession to Hassan Sannaiyeh and Abdul Latif (the son of the former, Abdulla ben Hassan being excluded for personal reasons urged by Colonel Cox) of oxide mining rights on Abu Musa, so as to enable them to carry out their contract with Messrs. Woenckhaus.

2. The amount of damages suffered by Messrs. Woenckhaus through the interruption of the contract to be referred to some British tribunal, and the amount to be paid through His Majesty's Government on behalf of the Government of India.

In order to safeguard the Sheikh of Shargah, the new concession under 1 would have to provide that no share in the enterprise was to be transferred to another person without the sheikh's consent, and should also give him access to the books of the company and control over the working of the mines: the partners in the previous concession, up to the date of its cancellation, being all British subjects, it could fairly be claimed that the terms of the new concession do not affect the German Government, who are merely concerned with the execution of Messrs. Woenckhaus' contract.

If the German Government were to decline to accept these proposals, His Majesty's Government might with greater facility take the line that the right of the sheikh to

cancel a concession held by British subjects was not a matter which they could consent to submit to arbitration, while the injury caused to Messrs. Woenckhaus by the failure of a British subject to carry out his contract was a matter which could be adequately dealt with before the judicial tribunals, a course for which His Majesty's Government would provide every facility.

In conclusion, I am to express Sir E. Grey's confident hope that Lord Crewe will accept the view that the payment of damages will devolve not upon His Majesty's Government but upon the Government of India: the original action of the British resident, in his capacity as agent of the Government of India, was taken under the instructions of that Government; while the delay which has arisen in preparing the replies to the German notes is in no case due, as will appear from a comparison of dates, to this department, where, both in 1908 and in February of the present year, the utmost promptitude was manifested.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[40804] No. 78.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 9.)

(No. 245.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, November 9, 1910.*

LYNCH'S steamers.

Referring to your telegram No. 329 of yesterday:

I heard yesterday from the Minister of the Interior that the Vali of Bussorah has been instructed by telegraph to allown Lynch to replace the "Julnar" by the "Blosse Lynch."

[40948] No. 79.

Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to Foreign Office.—(Received November 10.)

3, *Salters' Hall Court, Cannon Street, London, November*, 9, 1910.

Sir,

WITH reference to our letter of the 7th instant, I have the honour to inform you that we have a further telegram, dated the 7th instant, from our agent in Bussorah, stating that our steamer "Julnar" must be laid up till receipt from us of duplicates of the damaged parts of the machinery, and urging us to hasten in obtaining leave to substitute the "Blosse Lynch," as the detention of British mails and accumulation of upward cargo in our hands (now exceeding 3,000 tons) is a serious hindrance to British-Indian trade with Bagdad.

I have, &c.
H. W. MACLEAN, *Secretary.*

[40804] No. 80.

Foreign Office to Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company.

Sir, *Foreign Office, November 10, 1910.*

WITH further reference to your letter of the 7th instant, respecting your reserve steamer on the River Tigris, I am directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to inform you that a telegram has been received from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople to the effect that the Turkish Minister of the Interior has informed him that he has telegraphed to the Vali of Bussorah to allow the "Blosse Lynch" to be substituted for the "Julnar."

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[41042] No. 81.

Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to Foreign Office.—(Received November 11.)

3, *Salter's Hall Court, Cannon Street, London, November 10, 1910.*

Sir,

WITH further reference to my letter of the 13th ultimo on the subject of navigation of the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers, I am directed by my board to call your attention to the fact that, in any conversations which may be taking place between His Majesty's Ambassador in Constantinople and the Porte on this subject, recent circumstances have thrown into relief the undoubted strength of our case. As I informed you in my recent letters, there are now over 6,000 tons of cargo, almost exclusively British and Indian, detained at Bussorah for want of proper facilities of transport to Bagdad. My board is prepared to put a fourth steamer, with barges, on the Tigris run at once, in order to deal with this accumulation. The position, therefore, is that the Turkish Government, having refused our offer to effect a fusion between the two existing companies and at once to add to the tonnage on the river in the name of the joint concern, has failed to put additional tonnage on itself. We are informed that it is not in a position to put on such additional tonnage, and, even if it were, my board would count upon the support of His Majesty's Government in securing that the British company should be accorded equal facilities.

I am to add that nothing whatever has been done by the Turkish Government to improve the course of the Tigris, which you will remember was one of the objects of the fusion scheme. This fact, and the stoppage of British and Indian cargo at Bussorah, would seem to indicate a deliberate attempt to strangle British trade in order to pave the way for a German monopoly of transport by means of the Bagdad Railway.

We are confidentially informed by our representative in Constantinople, under date of the 3rd instant, that he has been given to understand that the Council of Ministers will without delay ratify the permits given by the Vali of Bagdad to native subjects to put steamers on the river. A considerable time must of course elapse before these steamers can be built and put on. A permit to ply between Bussorah and Bagdad has been granted by the vali to a certain Abdul Kader-el-Khedery, and we understand that this gentleman is in close touch with the agents of the German Hamburg-America Line.

In our despatch of the 13th ultimo, cited above, we detailed the various courses which seemed to us open to His Majesty's Government to pursue in dealing with the present grave situation. We did not there exclude application in the name of a native for a permit to run steamers under the Ottoman flag, in which we should have a controlling interest, but we would point out that this course would—

1. Not meet the needs of the existing situation, and would probably entail delays and difficulties in its execution; and
2. Would almost certainly involve the appearance of German interests on the river.

Permission to the present British company to add to its tonnage would, on the other hand, supply the necessary facilities at once, and might have the effect of preventing the disturbance of the *status quo* on the rivers.

I have, &c.
H. W. MACLEAN, *Secretary.*

[41228] No. 82.

Mr. D'Arcy to Foreign Office.—(Received November 12.)

Sir, 42, *Grosvenor Square, London, November 11, 1910.*

REFERRING to my letter dated the 8th April last, in connection with the concession for the oilfields of Mesopotamia which was promised to me by the Turkish Government some time ago, I beg to state that from information to hand from Constantinople it appears that active negotiations are again in progress between Mr. Chester and the Turkish Government for the Anatolian Railway project, and that important modifications of the original draft contract are under consideration.

One modification that I fear may be put forward, and which would seriously imperil the value of the concession which was promised to me, is that latitude may be given to the Chester group to start construction from either end, or both ends, of the proposed line without the onerous obligation contained in the original draft contract of completing construction of the line for the whole of the route from the Mediterranean to the Province of Moussoul before any portion of the oil part of the concession could be touched.

The danger of this would be that the American group, who are endeavouring to secure the Anatolian Railway concession together with its mining rights, might be able at a comparatively small cost and within a very short time to open up the valuable portions of the oilfields of Moussoul, which I have reason to believe are their principle objective, and thus seriously prejudice the value of the concession which was promised to me.

Under these circumstances I shall be extremely obliged if you would ask His Majesty's Minister at Constantinople to guard against this point, and to firmly resist the introduction into the proposed Anatolian Railway concession of any modifications which are likely to effect the value of the oil concession as a whole.

I am informed that the Chester group have indicated willingness to accept the Anatolian Railway concession outright, i.e., that they are not asking for an option, and that their proposals are receiving the warmest support of the Union and Progress Committee.

I have, &c.
W. K. D'ARCY.

[41204] No. 83.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 12.)

(No. 246.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, November 12, 1910.*

MY despatch No. 797 of the 31st October and your telegram No. 326 of the 26th October.

I have been verbally informed by the Minister of the Interior that he and his colleagues will arrange that British subjects who have suffered by the demolitions at Bagdad will receive compensation, and also that the Sheikh of Mohammerah will be allowed to register his property in the vilayet of Bussorah.

[41305] No. 84.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 808.)
Sir, *Constantinople, November 4, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 766 of the 26th October, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Damascus, reporting further concerning the campaign against the Druzes.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 84.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 51.)
Sir, *Damascus, October 18, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to report that authorities here profess to be pleased at the progress of affairs in Jebel Druze, where small batches of the insurrectionists are handing over their rifles, and a beginning of establishing the various branches of administration is already in hand.

As reported in my last letter, the troops occupied Shahba without any trouble, the residents having previously vacated the place and moved to villages near, viz., Um-el-Zeitun, El Intaneh, and Lehf-el-Lijeh, and then again they retired from the first-named of these three villages, leaving it to be seized by Sami Pasha, and hiding in the Lijah.

Meantime, another movement of four battalions, with some cavalry, started from Brack and Mismiye to advance on El Hit Nimra and Shahba, places distant a few miles north of Shahba coming from the north, and thus evidently, when they join forces with those moving from the south, the Lijah will be practically ringed in and blockaded.

During the last few days I have heard no reports of any fighting whatever, but it is said that a small night raid, doubtless by Druzes, was made on a farmstead near the town of Douma, on the Aleppo road, and 150 goats carried off towards Donmeyr. Several hundred of cattle and sheep have been lately brought into Damascus, of which part has been already sold and part is being gradually sold by the authorities. The proceeds of these sales are to be assigned for provision for Druze women and orphans.

I have, &c.
G. P. DEVEY.

P.S.—Troops are now at Khalkhaleh, and an independent force is acting under Major Najih Bey to close in the Lijah, while some Druzes are yielding up their arms from that district.

P.P.S. *October* 20.—2,400 rifles have been given up, but Sami Pasha thinks that there ought to have been more than this number.

G. P. D.

[41310] No. 85.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 814.)
Sir, *Constantinople, November 8, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, reporting on municipal demolitions at Karbala.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 85.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 888/52.)
Your Excellency, *Bagdad, October 7, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to enclose, at present for your information only, copies of correspondence relating to municipal demolitions at Karbala. It will be more convenient, for various reasons, to keep the question of these separate from that of municipal demolitions at Bagdad and Kadhimain.

Copies of the Karbala vice-consul's letters to me are not sent, as they are prolix and voluminous; but his report of the 7th October sums up the present situation.

M. Eram Bey has vouchsafed no reply to the letter which I sent him on the 5th September.

I am in hopes that the cases which have as yet arisen at Karbala may be susceptible of local arrangement, as the amount of the loss inflicted on British subjects seems likely to be small; but in only one instance has it yet been possible to form a precise estimate of the loss, the intentions of the municipality in the remainder being still undeclared. Moreover, I understand that the opening of new streets at Karbala is contemplated, which may involve the destruction of houses of high value belonging to British subjects. So far there has not been at Karbala any interference except with shops, &c., of comparatively trifling value.

I have, &c.
J. G. LORIMER, *I.C.S.*,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

Enclosure 2 in No. 85.

Consul-General Lorimer to British Vice-Consul, Karbala.

(Confidential.)
Dear Muhammad Hasan, *Bagdad, August* 5, 1910.

PLEASE take steps to have separate valuations made at once of shops and houses belonging to British subjects at Karbala, which may be in danger of demolition in connection with municipal improvements.

You should, if necessary, bring the requirements of the Turkish law to the notice of the mutessarif, and insist upon their being observed. The most important of these are—

1. That what is intended to be done must first be announced and explained to the owners by means of a plan;
2. That a period must be allowed them for lodging objections after notice has been given;
3. That the land required for widening a street must be taken on both sides of the same equally, and not on one side only;
4. That, if one-fourth or less of the depth of the property is taken, the municipality must rebuild the front wall at its own expense, or pay the owner in order that he may do so;
5. That, if more than one-fourth of depth is taken, full compensation must be paid;
6. That the property must not be taken until the compensation due has been paid.

The laws in question are that of the 21st Jamadi-ul-Awwal, 1296 A.H., and that of 18th Muharram, 1309 A.H.

If the municipal or other authorities violate these laws in any way they will be liable to suits for damages.

Please report to me on the subject without delay. There is so much of this kind of work going on at Bagdad at present, besides interference with trade, that I see no chance of getting away to Karbala; also I have not yet received the orders of the Government of India about the Oudh Bequest.

J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 3 in No. 85.

Consul-General Lorimer to British Vice-Consul, Karbala.

(Confidential.)
Dear Muhammad Hasan, *Bagdad, August* 11, 1910.

I HAVE received your letter of the 9th August about demolition and expropriation of immovable property belonging to British subjects at Karbala.

You have taken the right line in arguing with the mutessarif by saying that, in cases of immovable property, even if the Turkish law is violated to the disadvantage of our subjects, we are entitled to intervene officially. I am maintaining the same principle here in my discussions with the vilayet, and shall continue to do so; and you should do likewise. Of course, if the Turks use force, we can do nothing except report the matter to the embassy at Constantinople; so, if the law is violated at Karbala, you must lose no time in informing me of the facts by special letter.

You should at once make a valuation of Ali Hashim's shop, if you have not already done so, for future use. I would advise you to go and look at it yourself. I did this myself at Bagdad in the case of Messrs. Lynch's and Abdul Ali's premises, and I am told that the fact of my having gone to the spot made the Turkish authorities hesitate. They have now knocked down a wall belonging to Messrs. Lynch, but Abdul Ali's shop still stands. You should support your valuation by calculations, examples of transactions in the neighbourhood, and deposition of the owner, &c.

I think you will know how to be polite and firm at the same time.

J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 4 in No. 85.

Consul-General Lorimer to British Vice-Consul, Karbala.

(Confidential.)
Dear Muhammad Hasan, *Bagdad, September* 5, 1910.

I HAVE received your letter of the 29th August.

In the case of British subjects whose immovable property is threatened you must continue, as a rule, to insist on the strict observance by the Turkish authorities of the Turkish laws, viz., the expropriation law of the 21st Jamadi ul-Awwal, A.H. 1296, and the building law of the 18th Muharram, A.H. 1309.

If, in any particular instance, a British subject wishes to waive his legal rights and to forego consular protection, you must obtain from him a declaration in proper form, signed and sealed by him, to this effect.

We are having great trouble over this very question at Bagdad, and a wall and six small shops belonging to Messrs. Lynch have been unlawfully destroyed; but the question has gone up to Constantinople, and I do not think that any more illegal demolitions will take place here.

You will remember that, even when the portion of the property taken is less than one-fourth, the municipality is bound to pay the cost of rebuilding the front and interior.

I shall write to the vilayet unofficially and try and get them to restrain the mutessarif from illegal action against the property of British subjects at Karbala.

J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 5 in No. 85.

Consul-General Lorimer to M. Eram Bey.

(Private.)
Dear M. Eram Bey, *Bagdad, September* 5, 1910.

YOU spoke to me the other day about a disagreement between the mutessarif of Karbala and the British vice-consul there, and I was able to inform you that the cause was threatened interference by the municipality with some houses and shops of British Indian subjects.

I have now received a long report on the subject from the vice-consul at Karbala; but perhaps, if his Excellency would remind the mutessarif of the necessity of observing the Turkish law strictly, this would stop the trouble in the beginning. I refer particularly to the Expropriation Law of the 15th May, 1879, and the Building Law of the 22nd August, 1891. The most important provisions of these are:—

1. That more than one-quarter of a property cannot be taken until after compensation has been legally fixed and paid; and
2. That, where the part taken is one-quarter or less, the façade and interior must be reconstructed at the expense of the expropriating authority.

I venture to make this suggestion in the interest of smooth relations between the vilayet and this consulate-general, and to prevent the extension to Karbala, if it is not already too late, of the trouble which has arisen at Bagdad over shops and houses.

J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 6 in No. 85.

Report by the British Vice-Consul, Karbala.

ABOUT three months ago, under the orders of the vali, the mutessarif of Karbala undertook the renovation of the town of Karbala. As there was no money to meet the necessary expenses, in the way of compensation to the proprietors, wages of labourers, &c., no regard whatsoever was paid to law and justice. The local authorities and the municipality were obliged to carry out the improvements at the expense of the people; and consequently, civil rights were infringed. Not only this, but by threats and underhand proceedings they forced the people into submission.

To start with, no regular notice was given to the owners or the shopkeepers to vacate the shops. The crier of the municipality informed the shopkeepers of the

demolition of the bazaar during the day, and on the night following the roofing of the bazaar was demolished. Next morning the people were obliged to remove their property from their shops. The next step of the authorities in this direction was to order the people to demolish their shops, &c., and to rebuild them at their own expense.

As there were British subjects who were proprietors, I, seeing these arbitrary and high handed proceedings, in order to safeguard their interests, held several discussions with the mutessarif, and insisted on the strict observance of the Turkish law regulating property. The mutessarif on each occasion invariably promised to act according to the law; but, when it came to practice, he did not keep his promises.

To illustrate the oppression practised by the authorities, it would be sufficient to state that, notwithstanding the offer of help I made to British subjects in connection with their property, the majority demolished and rebuilt them at their own expense without a murmur. From this the condition of the Arab and Persian proprietors can very well be judged.

Among the British subjects, however, who stood up for their rights are the following:—

(*a.*) Haji Mirza Ahmad (Akhbari);
(*b.*) Seyyid Muhammad (Kashmiri); and
(*c.*) Haji Zain-ul-'Abidin (Akhbari).

1. A shop situated in the Hazrat Abbas bazaar, half of which belongs to the Akhbari, who is a British subject, and the rest to two Turkish subjects, came under expropriation; but the amount taken from it exceeded one quarter of the whole by $\frac{20}{100}$ of a metre. The Akhbari's share in this excess was $\frac{10}{1000}$, for which the Government promised to pay him afterwards. The shop was, however, rebuilt by the partner; but since then the Akhbari's efforts to realise the value, which is nearly 4 liras, have proved fruitless, and there are no signs of the authorities paying the money.

2. In the same bazaar the road on both sides was so curved at one end that the Government, with a view to straightening it, had to cut more off the shops on the one side and to give a small portion of the bazaar to the shops on the other. According to law the disposable portion ought to have been sold formally by public auction, and the proceeds given to the owners on the side who lost more of their property than was specified by law. The head of the municipality took a different step from this; he gave the piece in front of each shop to that shop without public sale or formal proceedings. At night (so it is said) he went round and squeezed as much money from the owners as he could, so secretly that none besides him and the payers knew it. Close to the shops in question is situated a large "kaizarieh" or private bazaar, belonging to the Akhbari, the owner of a half shop mentioned above. The door of this place, including the masonry on each side of it, measures 9 ft. 3 in. across. The spare ground in front of the door is therefore of that length, and it is 2 ft. 2 in. broad. The municipality wants to sell it to the Akhbari, and threatening messages have been sent him, requiring him to meet the wishes of the municipality, otherwise it will block up the door of the "kaizarieh" leaving him only a side entrance six-tenths of a metre wide. This is rather cruel dealing, when others have been dealt with so generously and against the law, that the Akhbari should be pressed to pay a high price which has not been fixed by auction or impartial experts. A Persian shop in front of the "kaizarieh" is going to lose the major portion of it, and it is desired to compensate the owner out of this little front piece, and therefore people are being put up to offer exorbitant prices for it. The last pressure they brought upon the Akhbari was to satisfy the owner of the front shop and take possession of the space. On the night of the 28th September a foundation to build a shop upon was begun at the foot of the "kaizarieh," and, if this really goes up, the "kaizarieh" will lose half its splendour. A petition which was recently given to the acting mutessarif in this connection was torn up by him with fury.

I have been told that the late mutessarif specially asked the kadhi and the president of the municipality to deal rather roughly with the Indians.

3. Another British subject named Seyyid Muhammad has two shops, situated contiguous to each other on two sides of a corner of a wall, and each facing a different quarter of the bazaar. The large one has given to the road more than a quarter, and the small one is now in danger of losing about three-fourths without compensation. The authorities claim that both the shops are one; but in saying so they forget that, whether they are one or two, the total they want from them exceeds one-fourth of the whole. Seyyid Muhammad's Shari'ah deed, attested and registered by a late kadhi,

speaks of the place as "a shop and the 'kanarah' (butcher's shop) behind it." A wall now demolished stood between the two and separated them from each other. Each was let separately; the small one fetched 3 liras per mensem, and its value is between 50 and 70 liras. I cannot now say how much will be taken from it, as experience has shown that the municipality's plans change every minute according to its wishes. The case is still pending, and, unless immediate orders are sent to prevent them, the municipality will take action.

4. The case of a shop belonging to Haji Zain-ul-'Abidin (Akhbari) and situated in the Persian draper's bazaar is still pending. The shop was demolished by the municipality, and for several days it was left in a ruined state, to be rebuilt by the owner. When I insisted on its being made up by the municipality, and the mutessarif ordered the same, the president of the municipality induced a neighbour of the shop to claim that the whole of the wall between them belonged to him. Outsiders also supported the claim of the Akhbari. The dispute, however, went on between them for two days, and on the third evening Zain-ul-'Abidin, in the presence of the mutessarif, the president of the municipality, and others, pressed for digging up of the foundations, by which means the facts could be ascertained. This was a good and professional idea, but the mutessarif refused, and ordered that each of the parties should appoint an architect, who would decide upon the case and whose decision should be followed. This was agreed upon, but on the same night the president of the municipality ordered the neighbour—one Haji Husnin, a Persian—to build up the wall and take possession of it. In the morning Zain-ul-'Abidin complained to the mutessarif, who, instead of questioning the president of the municipality or restoring the wall to him, sent him to the municipality. Thence he was sent back to the mutessarif, and this was repeatedly done until he got tired and applied to me. When I sent him with my dragoman, the mutessarif referred him to the Shara' court, where the result after a week's running about, was no better than before. A friend of the Akhbari, however, learned from the kadhi that the latter had been ordered to treat the matter in a dilatory fashion. This was the first and only shop that was rebuilt by the municipality, and, owing to this it lost a wall, besides which some 6 bashlik's worth of wood which was stolen from it. It is still incomplete and unfit for letting, because the upper walls and the roofing of the bazaar—which last, by the municipality's order, is to be of iron—have not been put up. It has reached the level of the top of the doorway.

M. H. MOHSIN.

October 7, 1910.

[41311] No. 86.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—Received November 14.)

(No. 815.)

Sir, *Constantinople, November* 8, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 788 of the 31st October, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, submitting copy of a report by Mr. Parry in connection with the demolition of certain buildings at Bagdad.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 86.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 800.)

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, October* 7, 1910.

IN continuation of my despatch No. 860 of the 27th September, 1910, I have the honour to submit a copy of a report given me by Mr. Parry, the local representative of Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co., in connection with the progress—if it can be called progress—of negotiations between himself and the vilayet with regard to the recent demolition, in the name of the Bagdad municipality, of certain buildings at Bagdad belonging to his firm.

The papers enclosed do not appear to call for any comment upon my part.

I have, &c.
J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 2 in No. 86.

Notes for Mr. Lorimer regarding Negotiations with the Local Government in connection with the demolition of Walls and Shops on our Premises and the Ground required for Road widening purposes.

ON the 25th ultimo I met Djaved Bey and Eram Bey at my office with the object of endeavouring to come to some amicable settlement of the difficulties.

2. I informed them that I was acting as agents of the proprietors of the property, and any negotiations must be considered unofficial, but that I was willing to submit any reasonable proposal to London.

3. A plan was produced by Djaved Bey showing the section of the main road from the bazaar to a point 200 yards south of the south wall of the offices, in which the houses are shown on each side of the road with a red line cutting off 4 metres on each side, representing the widened road 11·40 metres wide.

4. I was told that the frontage of the houses immediately in front of our premises would be pulled down immediately after the Bairam holiday (say, 6th instant).

5. In answer to my inquiry, I was told that permission would be given to us to build on the property along the line where the shops and wall have been demolished only if we accepted a line 4 metres within the line of the demolished walls.

6. On pointing out that, if we built a wall along that line on one portion of the property, the main building (offices) would jut out into the widened road 4 metres, I was told that they would take the main building at some later date; and the law, which does not permit the reconstruction or repair to frontages on the road required for widening purposes without putting the wall back, would be put in force.

7. After much discussion, in which the desirability of a large firm like Lynch assisting the local government in carrying out improvements in the town and the advantages which would accrue if we set the example to the natives by giving our property without compensation was emphasised, I requested them to make me an offer which I could submit to my principals. An offer was made to the effect that, as a concession to us, they would take only 3 instead of 4 metres from our property.

This offer being absurd, I told the meeting that I could not send it to London, but, after persuasion, I consented to submit the offer, and telegraphed to London on the 28th ultimo. On the 30th ultimo I received a telegraphic reply, which read as follows:—

"Proposition pas raisonnable. Impossible accepter sans dédommagement équitable.—Lynch."

8. With the telegram referred to above I received a separate telegram, intimating that acceptance of any settlement must be based on compensation being paid for rebuilding premises and value of site in full.

9. It is my intention to show the first telegram to his Excellency the vali as soon as I can obtain an interview.

E. W. PARRY.

October 1, 1910.

[41312] No. 87.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 816.)

Sir, *Constantinople, November* 8, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, submitting copies of papers by Mr. Parry, relating to an attempt to divert trade from the Euphrates and Tigris Steamship Navigation Company.

I have, &c.

GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 87.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 892. Confidential.)

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, October* 7, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to enclose copies of papers which have lately been handed to me by Mr. Parry, manager of the British firm, Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co., at Bagdad, relating to an attempt to divert trade by unfair means from the Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company, of which Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co. are the representatives here, to the Turkish Government line of river steamers. The matter is a delicate one; and it is fortunate that Mr. Parry has been able, in the present case, to adjust it direct with the Turkish local authorities.

This is not the first instance of attempted administrative interference by the local government with the operations of British merchants, as your Excellency will perceive on reference to my despatch No. 768 of the 3rd September, 1910, about their treatment of Messrs Abdul Ali Brothers, British Indian firm of ice manufacturers and general merchants at Bagdad.

I have been unable to obtain from the vilayet any reply to a petition submitted through me on the 1st August, 1910, for permission for the establishment by Mr. A. B. Taylor, a British merchant at Bagdad, of a private kerosine store. This permission was sought in accordance with the terms of the Turkish law on the subject.

It is to be regretted that the new government of Bagdad should regard British commercial enterprise, as they apparently do, with an unfavourable eye; but I trust that further experience of the conditions of trade here will convince them of the advisability of aiding rather than of discouraging it. In connection with this subject, I would invite your Excellency's kind attention to remarks contained in my monthly summary for September under the headings VIII (2) and VIII (3).

I have, &c.

J. G. LORIMER, *I.C.S.*,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

Enclosure 2 in No. 87.

Note communicated to Consul-General Lorimer.

OUR rate of freight for horses from Bagdad to Bassorah is 5 medjidiés, and the rate charged by the Idareh Nahrieh steamers is 7 medjidiés.

2. Two years ago we declined to give a commission of 1 medjidié to Seyyid Mejid, a certain horse-broker, and charge shipper 7 medjidiés because we considered it unfair business.

3. Permission to ship horses must be obtained from the Mamour Beytar, in order that thoroughbred horses are prevented from leaving the country.

4. Seyyid Mejid arranged to give the Mamour Beytar 1 medjidié per horse and 5 medjidiés per horse to the Nahrieh steamers, and keep 1 medjidié himself on condition of the Government official declining to give a permit for shipment of horses if they are to be shipped by our steamers.

5. An attempt was made to stop horses being shipped by our steamer "Khalifah" at Garara by Mr. Eassa Khedery, but he, belonging to a powerful family, got the opposition removed. Later, on the 24th September, a shipper named Abbass took a shipping order from us to ship nine horses, and when he took his horses to be examined at the serai he was asked by what line of steamer he intended shipping; and, on learning that they were to be shipped by the Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company (Limited) steamer, the permit was refused.

6. Attached is a copy of an official letter addressed to his Excellency the Vali, dated the 6th September, on the subject.

7. On the 24th September Mr. Parry personally interviewed Seyyid Bey, his Excellency the Vali's aide-de-camp, and after much difficulty succeeded in getting him to endorse the permit for shipment of the nine horses belonging to Abbass. During the course of conversation on the subject he threatened to imprison Abbass for

complaining against a Government official, and only after Mr. Parry had in a friendly way refused to go out of his office without a promise that the man would not be molested did he agree to let the matter drop.

F. W. PARRY.

October 1, 1910.

Enclosure 3 in No. 87.

Mr. F. W. Parry to Nazim Pasha.

Bagdad, le 6 septembre, 1910.

J'AI l'honneur de porter humblement à la connaissance de votre Excellence le fait suivant :—

Le Mamour de Beytar, par un arrangement secret avec un certain courtier de chevaux, refuse de donner permis aux maquignons désirant embarquer leurs chevaux sur nos bateaux, et tâche de forcer ces maquignons d'embarquer tous leurs chevaux par les bateaux de l'Idareh Nahrieh.

Notre taux de nolis pour les chevaux jusqu'à Bassora est de 5 medjidiés par animal, tandis que celui de l'Idareh Nahrieh est de 7 medjidiés. Quelques-uns de ces maquignons désirent profiter de notre taux de fret, qui est plus à bon marché, mais ils sont empêchés par l'action injuste de cet officier du Gouvernement.

Étant persuadé de l'opinion libérale de votre Excellence sur les questions des affaires de commerce, je m'adresse à votre Excellence dans l'espoir que vous voudriez bien faire le nécessaire afin de remédier cet injuste traitement.

En vous priant de m'excuser la liberté que je viens de prendre, veuillez agréer, &c.

FRED. W. PARRY,
Manager, Stephen Lynch and Co.

[41313] No. 88.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 817).

Sir, *Constantinople, November* 8, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 505 of the 25th July, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, forwarding observations from Mr. Parry on the scheme for starting a steamer service between Bagdad and Mosul.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure 1 in No. 88.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 894. Very Confidential.)

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, October* 7, 1910.

IN continuation of my very Confidential despatch No. 511 of the 18th June, 1910, I have the honour to forward for your information, a copy of a demi-official letter which I have received from Mr. Parry, the agent of Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co., of Bagdad.

Your Excellency will observe that Mr. Parry does not say that he encouraged the overtures which were made to him for the secret participation of his firm in an indigenous scheme for starting a steamer service between Bagdad and Mosul, but neither does he state that he refused to entertain them, and I conclude that the matter has probably been left open.

It does not appear to me that the desire of a firm of Ottoman subjects to obtain secret financial backing from Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co. in a navigation enterprise,

really bears in any way upon the very different question of the establishment of a navigation monopoly the operations of which would be controlled, through a majority in the directorate, by non-Ottoman subjects.

I have, &c.
J. G. LORIMER, *I.C.S.*,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

Enclosure 2 in No. 88.

Mr. Parry to Consul-General Lorimer.

Dear Mr. Lorimer, *Bagdad, October* 2, 1910.

IN confirmation of the verbal information given you on several occasions regarding the permissions granted by the local Government to Ottoman subjects to run steamers on the Tigris, I have to report that Mr. Aziz, of Messrs. Shukur and Aziz, a well-known and wealthy firm trading at Bagdad and Mosul, approached me confidentially on the 30th ultimo with a proposal to secretly become interested with them in forming a financial group to exploit a permit to run steamers between Bagdad and Mosul, which had been promised to them. Mr. Aziz said that there would be no difficulty in obtaining the permit, and from enquiries made at Constantinople they learned that it would be confirmed by the central Government provided no foreigners took part in the management of the business.

Recently Mr. Abdul Kader-el-Khedery informed me that he expected shortly to hear his permit to run steamers between Bagdad and Bussorah would be ratified.

I pointed out to both these gentlemen the futility of obtaining permits to run steamers on a river which in a few years would not contain sufficient water for navigation purposes if the Turkish Government irrigation schemes are carried out in their entirety, but they said that those schemes would not be finished for many years, and perhaps not at all; consequently they are content to make as much out of the river as they could while the water is in it. In passing on this information, which I beg you to treat with strict confidence as far as regard the individuals named herein are concerned, I desire to point out and emphasise the illustration Messrs. Shukur and Aziz' proposals afford with regard to the views influential natives have of the anti-foreign agitation which has been made so much of in official circles.

On one side we have influential Ottoman subjects asking us to assist them secretly in developing the navigation of the rivers, and on the other side we are told that the feeling against us is so strong in Bagdad that an amalgamation of two most important concerns on the river would be prejudicial to the welfare of the country.

It would seem obvious, if well-known natives appeal to us for secret assistance in conducting their developing schemes, that they know they cannot conduct them satisfactorily alone; and it would also seem obvious that, if we do not come to their assistance, other channels are open to them to get secret assistance from foreigners who are endeavouring, with the strong support of their Government, to assail the British position in Mesopotamia.

Yours sincerely,
F. W. PARRY.

[41315] No. 89.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 819.)

Sir, *Constantinople, November* 8, 1910.

WITH reference to your despatch No. 109 of the 25th April on the subject of refund of duty paid on Messrs. Lynch's new steamer, the "Julnar," originally intended to ply on Persian waters, I had the honour to remark in my despatch No. 284 of the 4th May, 1910, that it would be solely on the precedent of 1877 and not on the question of principle that any chance of success was to be hoped for.

I put in a written application to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which, after referring the matter to their Conseillers légistes, wrote to Bussorah for further details. The reply was duly communicated to the Grand Vizierate, which, after consideration, decided that an old régime precedent of 1877 could not validly be followed under the

new régime, since the inauguration of which all machinery and steamers imported in parts, even for Government concerns, have had to pay duty in full. I have pointed out directly and through Mr. Crawford that the new practice discouraged local industry, and though some hope is held out that some fresh legislation may be enacted to allow of a refund of duty in such cases, there is no chance of a law of the kind being retroactive.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

[41316] No. 90.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 820.)
Sir,

Pera, November 8, 1910.

WITH reference to your despatch No. 331 of the 1st instant concerning the refusal of the Vali of Bussorah to allow Messrs. Lynch to substitute the reserve steamer "Blosse Lynch" for any steamer that may have to be temporarily withdrawn from service, I have the honour to report that I was recently telegraphically informed that the "Julnar" has been damaged, and that the vali, under the plea that he could not allow the "Blosse Lynch" to replace her, had referred the matter to the Minister of the Interior. I caused representations to be made to the latter, who now declares that he has had the matter discussed in the Council of Ministers; that a favourable decision has been come to; and that he is telegraphing to the Vali of Bussorah to allow the "Blosse Lynch" to be substituted for the "Julnar."

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

[41318] No. 91.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 822.)
Sir,

Constantinople, November 8, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a map* from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, together with copy of a letter from Sir William Willcocks, explaining the possible railways from Bagdad to Bussorah.

I would be much obliged if the inclosed map could be sent to the Director of Military Operations for reproduction, and if copies could be furnished to this embassy.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

Enclosure in No. 91.

Sir W. Willcocks to Consul-General Lorimer.

My dear Lorimer,

Bagdad, October 7, 1910.

I ENCLOSE two copies of a plan showing all possible railways between Bagdad and Bussorah.

As far as I can see I shall be forced to make an escape for the Tigris down the depression which runs from the extreme end of the Ctesiphon curve down to Nasria. Once the escape is made the Tigris in the Amara reach will be capable of great development, and I must carefully examine this tract, which hitherto I have overlooked, as it is a kind of wash-pot for the Tigris.

The first result will be that the line of railway down the left bank of the Tigris from Bagdad to Kut and thence to Amara, Gurna, and Bussorah, will become an excellent line of railway, the shortest and the best between Bagdad and Bussorah.

The navigation of the Tigris downstreams of Amara hangs on such a fine thread and may any day come to a dead stop that we should be ready with an alternative Tigris railway.

* Not reproduced.

Bagdad without the Tigris navigation will be an unimportant town unless a railway quickly takes its place.

Mind the Euphrates has completely changed its course in two different places, and so can the Tigris. It has done so in the past.

Yours sincerely,
W. WILLCOCKS.

[41320] No. 92.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 824.)
Sir,

Pera, November 8, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch No. 326 of the 28th ultimo, by which you transmit to me copy of a letter from the Euphrates and Tigris Navigation Company, drawing attention to the permits granted to natives for navigation, and enquiring if His Majesty's Government would acquiesce in their sending a tug and barge up the Euphrates, while further suggesting the formation by them of an Ottoman company to ply on both the Tigris and Euphrates and their tributaries. You add that, so long as the position of the company is not threatened by changes in the *status quo ante*, you are prepared to leave things as they are for the present, but that you consider it essential to obtain for them such freedom as is necessary to enable them to protect themselves from the evil effects of increased competition.

The *status quo ante*, the fusion negotiations, was that the ex-Sultan's civil list had a monopoly of the navigation, limited by Messrs. Lynch's right to run three steamers on the Tigris. When Abdul Hamid was deposed, his civil list properties in those regions were transferred to the Ministry of Finance, and after the breakdown in the Ottoman Chamber of the fusion scheme, the Government monopoly was abolished and the principle adopted of throwing the navigation of both rivers open to Ottomans, Lynch's acquired position being respected. The *status quo ante*, as regards Messrs. Lynch, has, therefore, in a way remained unaltered. As regards the means of protecting Messrs. Lynch from the evil effects of increased competition, there seem to be three courses:—

1. To insist on the carrying out of the fusion scheme;
2. To prevent the Ottoman authorities from granting permits to private Ottomans; and
3. That Messrs. Lynch should, as suggested in the end of my despatch No. 598 of the 23rd August last, protect themselves from, or defeat competition by, indirectly obtaining permits locally under Ottoman disguise to run other steamers on the rivers, *e.g.*, on the lines of the overtures for secret participation in a Bagdad–Mosul service reported in Consul-general Lorimer's despatch No. 55 of the 7th October, forwarded in my despatch No. 817 of to-day's date.

One hears at times of the dreaded German competition under some Ottoman disguise, and it seems inconceivable that Messrs. Lynch with their long established local position at Bagdad should be unable to adopt the same methods as their possible rivals. It is obviously futile for Messrs. Lynch *qua* foreigners to apply to the Central Government for a "permit to form an Ottoman company distinct from their own company to ply on the Tigris and Euphrates with their tributaries," or for a permit to "send a tug and barge up the Euphrates with a view to establishing a regular service, while it is difficult to understand why either of these projects should necessarily require the acquiescence of, or find favour with, His Majesty's Government. Messrs. Lynch must be aware, as reported in my despatch No. 598 of the 23rd August last, that the underlying idea which wrecked the fusion scheme was to throw open the rivers to the Ottoman flag by granting permits, and that consequently the applicants must be Ottomans. I have discussed this latter point with Messrs Lynch's agent here, who says that he has done his best to impress it on Messrs. Lynch. The natural course would thus be that the application for the permit for the tug and barge on the Euphrates or for a disguised Lynch-Ottoman company for both rivers and tributaries should be made through an Ottoman subject at Bagdad.

As regards the second course, viz., endeavouring to prevent the Ottoman authorities from granting permits to private Ottomans, I have tried to obtain this result by

reminding the central Government from time to time of the old pledges concerning the fusion scheme, but such a negative policy has not been, and cannot be, availing in the long run. I have lately again spoken to the Grand Vizier and unofficially to the Minister of Public Works deprecating the sanctioning of the permit reported to have been given to Abdul Kader-el-Khedery to run two steamers between Bagdad and Bussorah and have been informed by both these authorities that they have no knowledge of the matter.

As regarding the first course of protecting Messrs. Lynch from the evil effects of increased competition, *i.e.*, insisting on the carrying out of the fusion scheme, I see little hope of success under existing conditions. I have several times pressed the present Grand Vizier on the subject but invariably met with the reply that the resolution of the Chamber of Deputies stipulated that the project should not be monopolistic in character, and that, if it involves a financial engagement for the Government, it must pass through Parliament. His Highness has recently requested Messrs. Lynch's agent here to discuss the matter with him with a view to finding a way out of these two difficulties, but I fail to see how such a result can be arrived at, for, as the letter forming the enclosure to your despatch No. 326 of the 28th October states, "the transference to the combined enterprise of the exclusive rights of the Turkish company has always formed an integral part of our scheme."

As will be remembered, the scheme was first discussed with the civil list under the old régime, and, after the change of Government in July 1908, took more tangible form under the Grand Viziérates of Kiamil Pasha and Hussein Hilmi Pasha, while, after the advent to power of the Committee Government, subsequent to the deposition of Abdul Hamid in April 1909, the present Ministers of Finance and of the Interior declared themselves in favour of it, and "determined to stand or fall by it." The inside committee, however, evidently came to a different decision, and when their pledges and promises were put to the test in Parliament they went back on their engagements, remained in power and made a scapegoat of Hussein Hilmi Pasha. The public opinion in Bagdad has veered round to a great extent, but "constitutional" Turkey is ruled not by majorities, but by a secret oligarchy, and it remains to be seen whether the inside committee has changed its views. Should the committee by any chance fall from power and Hilmi Pasha hold a prominent place in the new Cabinet, the fusion project, with perhaps some modifications, would undoubtedly stand a good chance of being realised. In the meantime, as stated above, Messrs. Lynch's only way of combatting increased competition would seem to be for them to obtain permits locally under Ottoman disguise.

I have, &c.
GERARD LOWTHER.

[41505] No. 93.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 218.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, November 14, 1910.*

WITH reference to Sir G. Lowther's telegram No. 225 of the 17th ultimo about the Island of Zakhnunieh, I am informed by telegram by His Majesty's consul at Bussorah that, according to a report from the Bahrein agent forwarded to him from Bushire, the force of gendarmes referred to in Bushire telegram No. 897 of the 26th September has fled from the island, and two of them who have come to Bahrein state that they deserted because they were afraid of the Bedouin.

This desertion may perhaps be an expedient devised by the Turks in order to avoid formally recalling their forces.

His Majesty's agent, however, anticipates the arrival within a few days of a new force, as the "contingent" from Bahrein is, as usual, now about to leave for Zakhnunieh for the winter season. (I presume that by "contingent" a party of fishermen is meant.)

[41693] No. 94.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 15.)

(No. 249.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, November 15, 1910.*

HIS Majesty's consul at Bussorah learns from His Majesty's consul-general at Bushire that the "Redbreast" reports that she saw no signs and heard no news of any Turkish mudirs either at Wakra or at Odeid, from which places she returned to Bushire on the 10th instant.

Above refers to your telegram No. 317 of the 21st October last.

[41042] No. 95.

Foreign Office to Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company.

Sir, *Foreign Office, November 16, 1910.*

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, suggesting that permission should be obtained from the Turkish Government for your company to navigate the River Tigris with four steamers instead of three, as at present.

I am to state that a copy of your letter will be sent to His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople, but that the Secretary of State is unable to express an opinion on your proposals as contained in your letter of the 13th October, and in your letter under reply, until he has received the observations of Sir G. Lowther and Mr. Marling.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[42224] No. 96.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 21.)

(No. 828.)
Sir, *Constantinople, November 12, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 541 of the 3rd August, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Erzeroum, transmitting copy of a despatch from Bitlis reporting on Kurdish lawlessness in the Khnyt district.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure 1 in No. 96.

Consul McGregor to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 88.)
Sir, *Erzeroum, October 30, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch which I have this day received from Mr. Safrastian, acting vice-consul at Bitlis, reporting on Kurdish lawlessness in the district of Khnyt, and commenting on the apathetic attitude of the local authorities.

I have, &c.
P. J. C. McGREGOR

Enclosure 2 in No. 96.

Acting Vice-Consul Safrastian to Consul McGregor.

Sir, *Bitlis, October 24, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to report that the situation in the district of Khnyt has of late become very acutely critical again in consequence of the weak and indecisive

policy followed by the Government towards the Kurdish brigandage and lawlessness in that district.

With reference to my despatch of the 12th July last the aggressors and murderers of soldiers have as yet not been arrested, some Belekli Kurds charged with the crime above referred to having been reported as being innocent men and not the real criminals. The presence of three battalions of soldiers and artillery in the district, sent there for the arrest and chastisement of criminals; their withdrawal in September last, after acquiring the minimum of the expected results; the unwillingness of authorities to deal properly with several intertribal murders and acts of violence committed by Belekli Kurds in Khuyt, of which references have been made in my various despatches during last summer, have pushed those unruly and barbarous Kurds to despise even the Constitutional Government, its decisions, and its laws. Under previous valis large areas of land in Khuyt and whole villages in certain cases unlawfully occupied by Kurds were restored to their Armenian proprietors in due course.

During the last three weeks, however, the ejected Belekli Kurds descended upon the Armenian villages of Taghavank, Lordentzor, Shen, &c., in Khuyt, and carried off by force almost all proceeds of the harvest and winter provisions belonging to the latter, on the ground that the grains and provisions in question were the products of lands disputed by Kurds themselves.

The Armenian priests and headmen in Khuyt stated to me they had been told by the above-mentioned Kurds to the effect that their forefathers and fathers had toiled like animals, and their own forefathers and fathers (Kurds) had enjoyed the fruits of the toil; the case was to be carried on also under the present generation. "They would recognize neither the 'Hurriet' nor any other law but their own rifles and cartridges." Some eighty women and children, headed by priests of Khuyt, proceeded here a week ago and petitioned Ismail Hakki Bey, the acting vali, in the above sense and in due details. Some zaptiehs dispatched from here on the spot have been unable to compel Kurds to restore the provisions taken off from Armenians by force, and it is to be feared that the half-famished Christians of the district will be left to face the severe winter in the mountains of Khuyt without grains and victuals if strong and immediate measures are not adopted by the authorities to bring these Kurdish parasites to reason before the snowfall.

I have, &c.
A. S. SAFRASTIAN.

[42534] No. 97.

The Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to Foreign Office.—(Received November 22.)

3, *Salter's Hall Court, Cannon Street, London,*
November 21, 1910.

Sir,

AT a full meeting of my board this morning recent communications between our agents, Messrs. Lynch Brothers, and yourself on the subject of the threatened demolition of their premises were discussed. I am directed to call your attention to the fact that not only the offices of our local agents but the machinery and repair shops for this company's fleet are involved by the proposed arbitrary action of the Turkish local authorities, and I am to express the hope that strong steps may be taken by His Majesty's Government in the matter, which affects all foreign interests in Turkey.

I have, &c.
H. W. MACLEAN,
Secretary.

[42529] No. 98.

Messrs. Lynch Brothers to Foreign Office.—(Received November 22.)

3, *Salters' Hall Court, Cannon Street, London,*
November 21, 1910.

Sir,

WITH further reference to the telegram from our agents in Bagdad which Colonel Picot read to Mr. Maxwell on Wednesday, of which we attach a copy, to the

effect that a notice had been posted on our main premises in Bagdad by the local government, notifying that they would be pulled down on the 29th instant, and to previous communications written and verbal on the subject of this contemplated demolition, we should be obliged if you would kindly inform us whether instructions have been sent to His Majesty's chargé d'affaires in Constantinople to do his utmost to prevent the premises being pulled down in this wholly arbitrary manner until the question of compensation, and its amount, has been settled, as already arranged between His Majesty's Ambassador and the central Government.

We have, &c.
LYNCH BROTHERS.

Enclosure in No. 98.

Messrs. S. Lynch and Co. to Messrs. Lynch Brothers.

(Telegraphic.) *Bagdad, November* 14, 1910.

OFFICIAL notice has been given office be taken within fifteen days. We remove immediately unless we have instructions to contrary. We propose refuse receive 423 Turkish liras compensation, which, however, can be paid into Imperial Ottoman Bank, Bagdad, to comply with law.

[32529] No. 99.

Sir Edward Grey to Mr. Marling.

(No. 333.)

(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, November 22, 1910.*

WE have been informed by Lynch's agent at Bagdad that municipality threatens demolition of firm's premises on the 29th instant. Have you any further information from His Majesty's consul-general?

You should urge that, until settlement as to compensation on equitable lines has been effected through His Majesty's consul-general, demolition should be postponed.

[42752] No. 100.

Messrs. Lynch Brothers to Foreign Office.—(Received November 24.)

3, *Salters' Hall Court, Cannon Street.*
London, November 23, 1910.

Sir,

WITH reference to our letter of the 21st instant, we have the honour to enclose copy of telegram, dated the 22nd instant, received from our agents in Bagdad.

We have, &c.
LYNCH BROTHERS.

Enclosure in No. 100.

Messrs. S. Lynch and Co. to Messrs. Lynch Brothers.

(Telegraphic.) *Bagdad, November* 22, 1910.

THE political agent in Turkish Arabia has agreed to assessment. It is as follows:—

Site value of the land taken from extension premises (160 square mètres), £T. 207; taken from khan and offices (192 square mètres), £T. 249; rebuilding shop, £T. 261; rebuilding khan and office, £T. 1,184; above, with claim of £T. 495 for disturbance and other incidental expenses, make total claim £T. 2,396.

We have sent full details by last post. The political agent in Turkish Arabia has sent valuation to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople. We are acting in concert with political agent in Turkish Arabia. We shall have to leave offices this week.

[42534] No. 101.

Foreign Office to Tigris and Euphrates Steam Navigation Company.

Gentlemen, *Foreign Office, November* 24, 1910.

IN reply to your letter of the 21st instant, calling attention to the fact that the offices of your local agents as well as the machinery and repair shops of your fleet are involved in the threatened destruction of Messrs. Lynch Brothers premises at Bagdad, I am directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to inform you that instructions have been sent by telegraph to His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople to urge upon the Turkish Government the postponement of the execution of their threat of demolition until some satisfactory arrangement for compensation has been reached.

I am, &c.
W. LANGLEY.

[42529] No. 102.

Foreign Office to Messrs. Lynch Brothers.

Gentlemen, *Foreign Office, November* 24, 1910.

IN reply to your letter of the 21st instant, enquiring whether instructions had been sent to His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople with regard to the threatened demolition of your main premises at Bagdad, I am directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to inform you that Mr. Marling has been instructed, by telegraph, to urge the postponement of the work of demolition until some equitable arrangement for compensation has been reached.

I am, &c.
W. LANGLEY.

[41315] No. 103.

Foreign Office to Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company.

Gentlemen, *Foreign Office, November* 25, 1910.

I AM directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant, enquiring whether the Turkish Government have admitted your claim for a refund of duty paid to the Turkish customs at Bussorah on the parts of your new river steamer exported to Turkey and put together at Maaghil.

I am to state that in May last His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople addressed a written communication to the Turkish Government claiming a refund of the duty in question on the ground of the precedent of 1877, when the "Blosse Lynch" was admitted duty free.

Sir G. Lowther has now reported that this question was referred by the Porte to their legal advisers, and further details were called for from Bussorah.

The reply was duly communicated to the Grand Vizierate, which, after consideration, has now decided that the precedent of 1877, which occurred under the old régime, could not validly be followed under the new régime, since the inauguration of which all machinery and steamers imported in parts, even for Government concerns, have had to pay duty in full. Sir G. Lowther has pointed out to the Turkish Government, both directly and through Mr. Crawford, that the new practice discourages local industry, and, though some hope is held out that fresh legislation may be enacted to allow of a refund of duty in such cases, his Excellency reports that there is no chance of a law of the kind being retroactive.

In these circumstances, Sir Edward Grey regrets that he is unable to insist any further in the matter.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[43059] No. 104.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 28.)

(No. 840.)
Sir, *Constantinople, November* 19, 1910.

WITH reference to Sir G. Lowther's despatch No. 808 of the 4th November, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Damascus reporting the gradual subsiding of the Druze insurrection.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 104.

Consul Devey to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 52.)
Sir, *Damascus, November* 8, 1910.

REFERRING to my despatch of the 18th ultimo, I have the honour to state that the Jebel Druze appears to be returning to its normal conditions, save for the presence of the troops.

Telegrams in certain newspapers of about the 22nd ultimo had reported more fighting, and somewhat severe fighting, in the district of Safa; but nothing of the kind occurred to the best of my belief; on the contrary, Sami Pasha, with three battalions, had moved as far as a village named Turba, some 55 miles south-east of this city, and, instead of encountering resistance, had been welcomed by Druzes of that neighbourhood.

Those Druzes, reckoned to be about 2,500 in number, who had fled into the Lijah are believed to have left the district and dispersed in driblets. It is true that only 2,400 rifles had been given up three weeks ago, but the total now exceeds 4,000, and arms are still being collected slowly and without violence or oppressive and brutal search making. On the whole, it seems that the authorities are following a course of pacification and kindly treatment which is bearing good fruits, in that just these last two days some 250 Druze's recruits have arrived here in Damascus; during the very brief campaign both Sami Pasha and his assistant, Colonel Abdul Hamid Bey, have displayed, besides good strategy and military qualities, wisdom and tact in laying the basis of civil administration.

Yahia Bey Atrash was taken to Sweida on the 1st ultimo, and it was at that time believed that he would be tried without delay in about two weeks. However, such intention has not been carried out, and latterly there have been reports that, if tried, he would possibly be acquitted of taking part in recent disturbances, and, even if sentenced on any points, would suffer but a slight condemnation, while it is now imagined in some quarters that there will be no trial at all ultimately.

There may be some little jealousy between the vali and Sami Pasha, for I hear of a telegram quite recently sent by the former to the general congratulating him on successful operations, but with some acidity suggesting that he had exceeded his powers in enforcing conscription and the taking of the census without an Imperial firman. The general instructed the Mutessarif of Hauran to reply to this telegram, and the latter gave explanation that the levy of the census and conscription had been warranted by instructions from the Ministry of War.

If the present approach to pacification and order is to be lasting, the administration must be conducted with justice, impartiality, and integrity; otherwise, as soon as the military forces are withdrawn or reduced to a very small number, fresh trouble might again occur. It is surmised that Sami Pasha may be retained in the Hauran at least a year, and thus continue the work so well begun. Still, one should not be too optimistic. The general is applying for money for various purposes, I believe, including the rebuilding of fort and barrack at Salkhad.

I have, &c.
G. P. DEVEY.

[43062] No. 105.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 28.)

(No. 843.)

Sir, *Pera, November 23, 1910.*

WITH reference to your despatch No. 312 of the 17th October and Sir Gerard Lowther's despatch No. 797 of the 31st October concerning the arbitrary and aggressive proceedings of the Ottoman local authorities in Bagdad and Bussorah, I have the honour to enclose paraphrases of two telegrams from His Majesty's consul at Bagdad, reporting that the property numbered No. 6 in his despatch No. 42 of the 5th September has been demolished under circumstances of injury and insult, that the authorities had given notice of their intention to expropriate part of Messrs. Lynch's head offices at a price little more than a third of that estimated by their local manager, that it is rumoured locally that the temporary permission to tow barges given in 1909 is about to be withdrawn, and that the general effect produced on British subjects was so deplorable that some of them—presumably Indian Moslems—were actually becoming Ottoman subjects mainly owing to the apparent inability of the British authorities to afford them proper protection.

Mr. Lorimer also expresses the opinion that the Bagdad municipal loan should not be entrusted to the present local Government, or in any case should not be given until the question of compensation to British subjects has been settled.

I have further just received a written unofficial communication from the Minister for Foreign Affairs, complaining that Lynch's steamers fly the British flag when moored at Bagdad or Bussorah.

As regards the demolitions, Sir Gerard Lowther in his telegram No. 246 of the 11th instant reported to you that the Minister of the Interior had practically decided to indemnify the owners for their losses, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs gave me a similar assurance again yesterday morning. The Minister of the Interior has, moreover, declared that the Government has decided to pay such indemnities "should it be proved that the regulations on the subject have been contravened." In reply to the remark that after the buildings were removed it was difficult to prove that they were not in a dangerous state before demolition, he replied that there had also been numerous strong complaints from natives whose property had been similarly treated, that the matter might come up in Parliament, that one of the Bagdad committee deputies had received secret instructions to investigate the whole affair, that his conclusions seemed most damaging to the vali, that both native and foreign subjects would have to be indemnified, and that all his (the Minister's) colleagues were in favour of recalling Nazim Pasha.

General Nazim Pasha has the reputation of being a strict disciplinarian, and is rather the type of a blunt soldier who is ignorant, as his recent methods at Bagdad have shown, of the niceties of civil administration. As you are aware, he has been in opponent of the committee, and early in 1909 was suddenly appointed Minister of War by Kiamil Pasha, with the idea of compelling the officers to cease dabbling in politics. This excited the fierce anger of the committee, who promptly brought about the violent and unconstitutional fall of the Grand Vizier and his new War Minister. Again, after the mutiny of the 13th April, 1909, Nazim Pasha incurred the displeasure of the committee by accepting the post of commander of the mutinous Constantinople army corps, which he reduced to order, and advocated punishing without the intervention of the Macedonian forces. Being popular with the rank and file his presence in the capital was irksome to the committee, who apparently resolved to send him to the distant post of Bagdad, with the ulterior object of ruining his reputation and dismissing him as a failure. It is not impossible that Nazim Pasha's arbitrary methods of improving Bagdad were indirectly suggested to him by some member of the committee with a view to compassing his downfall, and it seems undoubted that they would like to be able to say that his recall was due to the English, to whom Nazim was reputed to be friendly. It is on this account that in our written and verbal complaints about the recent high-handed proceedings at Bagdad this embassy has been careful to omit any mention of his name, and to refer always to "the local authorities" or "the Bagdad municipality." There seems little doubt now that Nazim Pasha's tenure of office at Bagdad will not last long.

With reference to Mr. Lorimer's suggestion that steps might be taken to defer the conclusion of the Bagdad municipal loan, I do not see how, in view of recent events, the embassy could approach the National Bank with that object.

As regards the expropriation of Messrs. Lynch's head offices, I have caused the Minister of the Interior to telegraph to the vali to see that the provisions of the Expropriation Law are not departed from, and informed Mr. Lorimer that, unless the authorities offer a reasonable price, Messrs. Lynch's agent should, if necessary, bring an action within fifteen days, as prescribed.

I have further had the Minister of the Interior's attention drawn to the threatened withdrawal of Messrs. Lynch's permission to tow barges, and to the fact that the existing accumulation of cargo at Bussorah makes it very inopportune to raise the question at the present moment.

In view of the present frame of mind of the Turkish authorities, they would not now be likely to entertain the suggestion in Messrs. Lynch's letter of the 21st October and that of the 10th November, 1910, enclosed in your despatches Nos. 335 and 346 of the 31st October and the 15th November respectively, that they should be allowed to use a fourth steamer to help to work off the congestion at Bussorah. In the Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company's letter of the 10th November it is stated that Mr. Abdul Kader-el-Khedery has been granted a permit to run steamers between Bagdad and Bussorah, and that this gentleman is understood to be in close touch with the agents of the German Hamburg-Amerika line. At first sight it is difficult to see why Messrs. Lynch's agent at Bagdad should not be in as close if not closer touch with Mr. Abdul Kader-el-Khedery.

The communication from the Porte complaining that Messrs. Lynch's steamers fly the British flag when moored at Bagdad and Bussorah seemed to contest the right of the original two steamers to carry the British flag. I at once caused energetic representations to be made on the subject, with the result that the Ministry for Foreign Affairs now declares that probably the local authorities confounded the two original steamers with the third steamer, for which permission was granted in January 1907, with the proviso that it should fly the Ottoman flag, and that their complaints refer only to alleged "irregularities" of the third steamer.

As regards the decision prohibiting the registration of Sheikh Kazal's lands at Failieh, the Porte has hinted that representations on the subject would more properly come from the Persian Embassy here, but has promised to re-examine the matter. I have telegraphed to His Majesty's consul at Bussorah to try and arrange that the sheikh's agent should move the new vali at Bussorah to again refer the matter to Constantinople for reconsideration. In a telegram of the 14th November, His Majesty's consul at Bussorah reported from Bushire that the "Redbreast" had visited Wakra and Odeid and found no sign of Turkish mudirs at those places, while, as reported in my telegram No. 248 of the 14th instant, His Majesty's consul-general at Bushire has since reported the desertion of the Turkish post at Zakhumiyeh. I would venture to suggest, for your consideration, the advisability of sending the "Redbreast" to Zakhumiyeh to ascertain whether any Turkish gendarmes are still there, and whether, as previously reported, the Turkish flag is still at the bottom of the mast. The visit of a British ship is certain to be reported, and its importance magnified by the local Arabs up to Bussorah and Bagdad, and its effect may counteract to a certain extent the deplorable impression among British subjects in Bagdad caused by the high-handed action of the Turkish local authorities.

The fact that this despatch is a report on some of the questions forming the subject of your despatch No. 312 of the 17th October must be my excuse for including in it more than one subject-matter.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure 1 in No. 105.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(Telegraphic.) P. *Bagdad, November 12, 1910.*

REFERRING to my telegram of the 8th instant and to your Excellency's telegram of the 10th instant, I regret to report that British reputation at Bagdad has fallen to a very low ebb, and I find that British subjects are seriously alarmed, seeing that their rights have never hitherto been so trampled upon here. For four months past they have been suffering from illegal oppression, from which there is no sign of any redress to come visible. A prosperous merchant, Abdul Ali, has talked of renouncing his British nationality for Turkish, and several British Indians have actually done so. If I

have so far failed to show your Excellency the serious nature of the situation, it has been only because I was unwilling to appear alarmist. The vali is incompetent, and under the influence of unscrupulous and ignorant underlings, and it is with regret that I am reduced to the conviction that he must be removed and replaced by a more intelligent man.

Yesterday they demolished part of the two storied building, No. 6, with circumstances of injury and insult, and have continued doing so to-day. The violence of the local authorities increases daily, and I can only conclude the Minister of the Interior is misleading your Excellency. The vali appears to treat the question as a personal one, and the next thing will be expropriations, which will cause great and as yet unforeseen losses to British subjects if carried out on the same lines as the demolitions. Could your Excellency not obtain compensation in even one case? It would to some extent allay the panic. Immediate payment to the ice manufacturer, whose case is clear, would effect this purpose.

The Bagdad municipality loan should not, I think, be entrusted to the present local Government, or, at any rate, not given till the amount of compensation payable to British subjects for the demolitions and prospective expropriations has been discussed and approved by His Majesty's Embassy. The loan will certainly be misspent, and the city will thus be saddled to no purpose with a heavy debt for a generation.

Enclosure 2 in No. 105.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Lowther.

(Telegraphic.) P. *Bagdad, November* 14, 1910.

REFERRING to my telegram of the 12th November last, I anticipate that I shall soon learn that a block of lofty houses owned by some Indian nawabs, to which I did not refer in my despatch of the 5th September last, will have been expropriated on scandalously unfair conditions.

Meanwhile, notice has been sent to Lynch's manager of the expropriation of 34 metres from the front of his office and warehouse, the expropriation to take effect in fifteen days, and compensation being fixed at 424 Turkish liras only. The unscrupulous character of the proceedings is shown by the fact that Lynch's manager estimates the cost of rebuilding on a new alignment would amount to some 1,184 liras, while the estimate made in my despatch of the 5th September came to 1,250 liras.

The total claim made by Lynch amounts to 2,396 liras, *i.e.*, for buildings which will now be expropriated 1,828 liras, for wall and shops wrongfully demolished 568 liras; though there is perhaps room for discussion regarding the items of the cost of reconstruction. I fear that a grave blow would be struck at British prestige, from which it will not easily recover, if Lynch's office and warehouse are destroyed and no proper compensation first fixed. It is absolutely necessary that the vilayet's proceedings should be checked, and the view is gaining ground here that the British Government cannot protect its subjects in Turkey.

[43070] No. 106.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received November 28.)

(No. 851.)

Sir, *Constantinople, November* 23, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 843 of to-day's date, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a copy of a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah respecting the Zakhmunieh question.

As Sir G. Lowther informed you in his telegram No. 225 of the 17th October last, the Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated to his Excellency that orders had been sent to the Vali of Bussorah that when the gendarmes left Zakhmunieh at the end of the fishing season, they should not be allowed to return there except under orders from Constantinople.

Sir G. Lowther telegraphed this information at the same time to His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, and requested him to ascertain whether these instructions had been received by the vali, and how far they had been acted upon; and in my telegram No. 248 of the 14th instant to you, I reported that the gendarmes had deserted from Zakhmunieh, perhaps as an expedient to avoid formal withdrawal.

It would seem, from Mr. Crow's present despatch, that the vali denied that he had received any instructions on the subject from the Ministry of the Interior, maintained that the island was Turkish property, and considered that His Majesty's consul had no right to enquire into the matter, either officially or privately, though he subsequently modified this attitude as far as to say that if His Majesty's consul addressed an enquiry to him officially he would consider it.

In all probability the vali's denials were "official" merely, and do not in the least mean that he has not received his instructions, while his claim that Zakhmunieh belongs to Turkey cannot be taken as an authoritative statement of the position of the Ottoman Government.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 106.

Consul Crow to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 62.)

Sir, *Bussorah, October* 27, 1910.

AS instructed by your Excellency's telegram of the 18th instant, I directed my dragoman to ask the vali privately and unofficially whether he had received the telegram from the Minister of the Interior, that the gendarmes sent to the island of Zakhmunieh for the fishing season should not return there except under special orders from Constantinople, and, if so, whether he had informed the Mutessarif of Hassa accordingly.

The vali replied that he had not at present received any telegram on this subject, that the island belonged to Turkey, and that this consulate had no right to enquire into their affairs either officially or privately. His Excellency then told my dragoman that he was astonished that the consul, whose business it was to watch trade, should interfere in political matters. My dragoman asked him to explain more precisely what he meant, but he dropped the subject, and on being informed that most of the people who fished in the island were foreigners, and that the enquiry on my part was justifiable, his Excellency was good enough to say that if the consul addressed him officially on the subject he would consider it.

I have informed the resident at Bushire accordingly.

I have, &c.

F. E. CROW.

[43467] No. 107.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 30.)

Sir, *India Office, November* 29, 1910.

WITH reference to the letter of this Office, dated the 24th October last, communicating copies of letters, dated the 4th and 18th September, 1910, from the political resident in the Persian Gulf to the Government of India, regarding certain cases of piracy in the neighbourhood of the Shatt-el-Arab, I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to enclose, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, copy of a telegram from the Government of India on the subject.

The main details of the outrages in question are summarised in the letter, dated the 20th September, 1910, of His Majesty's acting consul at Mohammerah to His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, and, in spite of the emphasis laid by the latter in his despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, dated the 28th September, 1910, on the difficulty of arriving at the truth, the Earl of Crewe sees no reason to doubt, on the information before him, that the failure of the Turkish local authorities to co-operate actively in the search for the authors of the outrages is mainly responsible for the fact that they are at large. The appointment of a new vali gives some hope of a change in this attitude, and, subject to the concurrence of Secretary Sir E. Grey, he would propose to address to the Government of India the telegram of which a copy is enclosed.

I am to observe that, in the case of the Dayir pirates in 1907, it was finally

decided that they should be handed over by the British authorities to the Sheikh of Mohammerah, whose subjects they were, and who, while objecting to their execution, gave guarantees for their safe custody.

I am, &c.
R. RITCHIE.

Enclosure 1 in No. 107.

Government of India to the Earl of Crewe.

(Telegraphic.) P. *November* 18, 1910.

REFERENCE is invited to papers enclosed in letter, dated the 6th ultimo, from Secretary to Government of India, Foreign Department, regarding piracy in the Persian Gulf. Suggestion is made both by the Sheikh of Mohammerah and by the Sheikh of Koweit that demand should be made by us of the authorities at Bussorah for surrender of pirates on the ground that we have made ourselves responsible for the security of the high seas on which piracy took place. Following telegram received from resident, Persian Gulf, who was asked the result of the letter, dated the 11th September, from Wilson to Crow :—

"There was a hope, at the time your telegram of the 20th ultimo was received, that Turks would afford a specific opening, which would have enabled a formal demand for surrender to be made by Sheikh of Mohammerah himself. No such opening, however, was given. Not the slightest attempt at co-operation with the Sheikh of Mohammerah in patrolling lower part of river has been made by the authorities at Bussorah, and request is now made by the sheikh that we will render him assistance by permitting His Majesty's ships to continue, as at present, patrolling from time to time between Mohammerah and the outer bar. All expectation of Turkish assistance has been abandoned by the sheikh. This is being arranged by me. Endeavour was informally made both by Wilson and myself to bring about a meeting at Mohammerah between Crow and ourselves; we might then have discussed this matter among others. Crow, however, could not leave Bussorah. Crow would, I presume, refer to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople before making any request to the vali in the sense suggested; in these circumstances, before instructing Wilson to consult him, I should be glad to be informed whether demand for surrender to Sheikh of Mohammerah or to ourselves is, *primâ facie*, preferred by the Government of India. There is little chance, I am afraid, that surrender either to ourselves or to Sheikh of Mohammerah would be agreed to by the Turkish Government."

Instructions are solicited for communication to resident, as representations regarding attitude of Turkish officials in the Gulf generally have been made to the Porte by His Majesty's Government.

Enclosure 2 in No. 107.

Major Cox to the Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) *Fao, December* 18, 1907.

SHEIKH of Mohammerah guarantees safe custody of pirates, who have been handed over to him. He intends to imprison them for life.

He made tribal and political objections to executing them publicly, although he admits their guilt.

[44027] No. 108.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 5.)

(No. 859.)

Sir, *Constantinople, November* 24, 1910.

WITH reference to Sir G. Lowther's telegram No. 238 of the 29th October, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah reporting further on the Mishri incident at Fedaghia and the action of the vali.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 108.

Consul Crow to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 61.)

Sir, *Bussorah, October* 26, 1910.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 71 of the 25th instant, I have the honour to report as follows :—

From information received here, which is corroborated by that of His Majesty's acting consul at Mohammerah, Suleiman Nazif Bey, before his departure, instructed the Kaimakam of Fao to try and arrange for the return of Mishri's expelled fellahs to his lands at Fedaghia, as they were "taba," i.e., fixtures on the land and cultivators from father to son, having the right to half the harvest of dates. Your Excellency will remember that the expulsion of these people by Mishri led to the Zein incident last April. Mishri was opposed to their return, and as Suleiman Nazif Bey left, the matter was dropped. The fellahs in question, who were evicted in April, took refuge with Naghaimish Ibrahim-bin-Naghaimish, a petty sheikh living at Ma'amer, near Fao, who, Mr. Wilson says, was concerned in the piracy of a Persian boat on the 8th March, and, as they were not reinstated, they appear, with the support of Naghaimish, to have taken the law into their own hands and concerted to exact compensation by robbing Mishri of his date harvest.

According to my information, Mishri's people telegraphed to the vali from Ashar to Bussorah, some days before the 18th October, and asked him to protect their gardens at Fedaghia, as they heard they were about to be attacked and plundered, but the vali seems to have taken no action on this telegram. The gardens were attacked on Tuesday night, the 18th October, by Arabs, and a large quantity of dates were stolen. On the 20th October the Kaimakam of Fao reported the attack, and said the dates had been carried off in several boats to the Persian side. The Mishris then put in a complaint to the vilayet to the same effect, stating their loss to be about 6,000 Turkish liras [*sic*] and alleging that the robbers numbered 500 persons [*sic*]. Both these figures are no doubt grossly exaggerated. Instructions were then given to the "Marmaris" to proceed to the scene of the robbery, and the vessel left on the 20th October with about thirty gendarmes under a Colonel Agassi, Shukri Effendi, who was instructed to enquire and report. On arrival at Fedaghia, they heard some of the robbers were still in possession, and several shots were fired in the air, but, finding no one there, the vessel left again for Fao.

While calling on the vali on the 24th October, on the occasion of the Sultan's birthday, I asked him if he had any cause to suspect support or instigation from Sheikh Khazal's people in the attack, and he said : "Ouimam," *i.e.*, "I do not believe so. The sheikh was away at the time up the Karun, and the attack was made by the Arabs and was an ordinary affair for the purposes of robbery, such as often occurs in the district."

The vali distinctly gave me to understand that he did not think that the attack had any connection with Mohammerah. I then told him that, according to my information, the trouble was caused by Mishri's evicted fellahs, but if he had any reason to suppose it was otherwise, and had any complaint to make in connection with it against Mohammerah, I should be glad to hear, as we were interested in the maintenance of friendly relations between Bussorah and Mohammerah, and though I was aware he disliked our intervention, yet I was ready to assist him in putting matters right if he would tell me what the trouble was. He thanked me, and said it was also to their interest to maintain friendly relations with the sheikh, but the matter was as I had stated, and nothing was required.

On the following day, the 25th October, I received news which leads me to think that the vali lied with a purpose and wilfully misled me. My dragoman obtained confidential information that on the 20th October, four days before my interview, the vali, in discussing the Mishri incident with his administrative council, verbally asked them to give their decision to attack Failieh and Mohammerah. The council did not consent to this, and the vali's proposal was not recorded, but his Excellency then telegraphed to Constantinople to the effect that the attack was instigated by Sheikhs Khazal and Mubarek, and occurred the day after the former had been decorated by the English.

As the evicted fellahs are subjects of the Sheikh of Mohammerah (according to Mr. Wilson's report) residing in Turkish territory, one would reasonably suppose that the Turks, if they wanted the sheikh to punish them and recover the stolen property,

would address the sheikh himself on the subject before resorting to such an extreme measure as that indicated by the vali's proposal to his council, but I am informed by Mr. Wilson that up to the 25th instant no communication from the Bussorah authorities had been received by the sheikh on the subject.

I have, &c.
F. E. CROW.

[43883] No. 109.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 3.)

(No. 861.)
Sir, *Constantinople, November 26, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to inform you that, according to telegrams received during the last two or three days from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah, a state of considerable insecurity prevails there and on the river; assassinations and robberies appear to occur almost every night. Amongst these incidents Mr. Crow was informed that an attack had been made on the 21st instant on the residence of a British subject of the name of Mitchell, who lives with his wife at Ajerawieh, a place on the river about 7 miles from His Majesty's consulate, and that about fifty shots had been exchanged. He also heard that the Mitchells had been fired at from the bank while they were in a boat last week. An enquiry made into this incident by the local authorities seems, however, to have proved that though there had been a good deal of firing on the river near Mitchell's house, the latter had not been directly attacked.

Mr. Crow fears that unless effective action is taken to suppress these disorders there will be danger of a disaster similar to the Mughil incident of February 1906, or that which he reported in February 1909 (see Sir G. Lowther's despatches No. 228 of the 31st March and No. 240 of the 5th April, 1909).

He states that the new vali seems to be powerless to put a stop to the disturbances, while the "Marmaris," which is being repainted, has not moved for several weeks.

I am making representations to the Minister for Foreign Affairs on the subject.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

[44031] No. 110.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 5.)

(No. 864.)
Sir, *Constantinople, November 30, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from the acting British consul-general at Beirout, reporting on local events at Beirout and in the Lebanon.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 110.

Acting Consul-General Young to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 55.)
Sir, *Beirout, November 15, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to submit the following notes on local affairs in this district:—

1. The tranquillity which prevailed during the quarter ended the 30th September throughout the Beirout vilayet and the province of the Lebanon continues.

2. No complaints are heard against the Vali of Beirout, Nur-el-Din Bey, who indeed, notwithstanding his inexperience of administrative business before taking up his present appointment, seems to be doing well. He talks little and refrains from idle promises, and has hitherto shown himself correct in intercourse and reasonable and well disposed in the transaction of affairs.

3. The appointment of a new mudir of police in succession to Jemal Bey has not yet been announced.

4. Emin Bey, commandant of gendarmerie (a native of Bagdad) is well spoken of, and the force under his orders appear to perform their duties with tact and efficiency.

Some credit for this is doubtless due to General Albera and the other Italian officers who assist him.

5. As reported on the 1st October, the judicial authorities seem to be doing better than of old, and the chief complaints one hears are based on their ignorance of the Arabic language and of local conditions.

6. There have been ten fatal cases of cholera in the lazaretto but none in the town, the general health of which is stated by the sanitary officials to be "perfect."

Thanks to the company which controls it under English management, the Beirout water-supply is excellent. But nothing can excuse the municipality for the deplorable state of the streets and the absence of the most elementary sanitary precautions. The vali has lately taken counsel with some of the leading European residents, but it is to be feared that jealousy may prevent the municipality from availing itself of their knowledge and experience, and, failing proper guarantee that their money will be honestly and sensibly spent, foreigners are naturally reluctant to come forward with the financial aid which seems to be expected of them in certain quarters.

7. The vice-consul at Haifa reports that fifteen Mussulmans have been arrested in connection with the murder of the German at Tireh last July, but it is understood that judicial proceedings will not be held in that district. Four Germans were committed for trial in connection with the murder of the Mussulman (which preceded that of the German), but the German Embassy appear to have objected to this on technical grounds. On the whole, it looks rather as though the German Government desire by a compromise to avoid the necessity for strong action.

Mr. Abela further reports the unveiling on the 25th October of a monument on the top of Mount Carmel to commemorate the visit of the German Emperor and Empress in 1898. This ceremony seems to have been somewhat of a failure; the German colony were, of course, present, but the Governors of Acre and Haifa, the military authorities and others, though specially invited, "by order of Baron von Mirbach, Grand Master of the Imperial Court," stayed away. The consular corps were not invited, and only about a "dozen natives" were sufficiently interested to attend.

8. Discussion is taking place in the local press regarding the application of the funds allotted by the Imperial Government to the improvement of communications in the district. There is 7,000,000 fr. for the purpose to be divided between Beirout, Damascus, and Jerusalem. Various schemes are put forward, but it seems far from certain that those most useful to the public will be adopted.

9. The progress of the Tripoli–Homs Railway has been separately dealt with in the report by Captain Newcombe, which was transmitted by this consulate-general.

Lebanon.

10. Apart from one or two changes among the kaimakams there has been little of political interest or significance to report, and the inhabitants of the neat and prosperous province seem to have less to complain of than those of any part of the Ottoman dominions. In fact there is little discontent, and what exists is promoted by office-seekers and their friends, who intrigue against those in power and endeavour to discredit them through the press or other means. As already reported, there has not been until now any likelihood of the Druzes of the Lebanon risking their lives or property for their brethren in the Hauran.

11. Two members of the administrative council (Khalil Akl and Elias Shereyi) have been suspended on a charge of corrupt practices. The question is before the judicial authorities, but it seems doubtful whether there is anything but personal animosity at the bottom of it. Both individuals were regarded as being rather hostile to Jousseuf Pasha, the governor.

12. Some attention has been devoted by the local press to a rumoured plot against the life of Jousseuf Pasha. The story, which seems improbable, is being investigated.

13. Isolated cases of murder and violence of various kinds have lately become regrettably frequent: and, though it would not be fair to draw from them unfavourable conclusions regarding the general state of the province, doubtless more energetic action and a few sharp examples, while assisting the prestige of Jousseuf Pasha (whose mildness is too evident), would have a salutary effect.

14. A lady calling herself Comtesse de Clermont-Tonnerre—she probably belongs to that family, but is the widow of a well-known manufacturer of champagne—lately passed through Beirout on her way to Bagdad and Afghanistan. Reference to her

movements will be found in the reports from the resident of Bagdad for the year 1907. The lady in question travels with an immense caravan, and is already well known in Mesopotamia and Persia. It seems doubtful whether the Indian political authorities will encourage her adventures in Afghanistan.

15. The plans of an Australian syndicate for mining in the Lebanon are dealt with in a separate despatch (No. 53 of 11th November).

I have, &c.
H. E. WILKIE YOUNG.

[44032] No. 111.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 5.)

(No. 865.)

Sir, *Constantinople, November 29, 1910.*

THE surmise that I ventured to make in my despatch No. 843 of the 22nd instant, that it was the intention of the "committee" to bring about the recall and disgrace of Nazim Pasha, appears to receive confirmation from a recent telegram I have received from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, reporting the rumours current as to the mission of Ismail Hakki Bey Babanzadeh. Mr. Lorimer says that the supposed object of his visit was to report on (1) Muntefik affairs; (2) British designs on Bussorah; and (3) Nazim Pasha's conduct of affairs generally, and that one result of the reports sent by the deputy in a secret cypher to the Grand Vizier and Minister of War is that Nazim has been instructed to proceed to the Muntefik country, an order which the vali is very reluctant to obey.

Ismail Hakki has also been instructed to report whether, in his opinion, Nazim Pasha should be entrusted with the expenditure of the loan which the municipality of Bagdad is contracting with the National Bank. Sir H. Babington Smith informs me that that operation, which was being discussed in the Council of Ministers, has now been referred back to the Council of State merely to give time for Ismail Hakki's report to reach Constantinople, and it seems to be a legitimate inference that the Council of Ministers expect a report adverse to the vali.

In my above-mentioned despatch I reported that Ismail Hakki had also been deputed to examine the complaints, both foreign and native, as to the recent arbitrary demolitions of house property, &c. The "Tanin," of the 25th, gives some extracts—translation of which I have the honour to transmit to you—of his reports, which in substance amount to a damaging criticism of the proceedings carried out in the vali's name. It is taken for granted that compensation will be paid to those who have suffered by the projected street improvements, and it is suggested that 10 per cent., or even 20 per cent., more than the sums now being offered would be well spent if the public excitement can thereby be calmed.

Rifaat Pasha, to whom I spoke on this question yesterday, informed me that compensation would certainly be paid, but he would not commit himself to promising that the sums claimed would be paid in full. I told him that Mr. Lorimer had been called on to furnish a list, carefully revised by himself, of British claims, and that I should present it as soon as it reached me, with a request for a settlement in full.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 111.

Extract from the "Tanin" of November 25, 1910.

(Translation.)

THE POSSIBILITY OF PROSPERITY FOR BAGDAD.

NAZIM PASHA desires to widen the streets of the town, particularly those suitable for electric tramways. Probably about 90,000*l.* of the Bagdad loan will be devoted to constructing a road 22 metres wide as nearly as possible parallel to the river. This is a very necessary project, but it has given rise to a great deal of talk. Some suggest making the road farther from the river, where it would contribute to the prosperity of the outlying parts, while costing only one-third as much as the projected road; but the road is needed in the commercial part of the town, and would be useless

in open ground. Some do not wish to be compelled to leave houses in which their families have lived for generations, while others are doubtful whether they will get compensation if their houses are demolished. Everyone is in a state of anxiety; but this feeling of fear and apprehension can be dispelled by repeated notices, by influential advice, and by active steps. Statesmanship and political necessity require that for a project to succeed it must be treated, not meanly and narrowly, but in a broad and lofty spirit; and it would be better to add 10 per cent. to the compensation money paid on expropriation if the minds of the people could be calmed and quieted thereby. This 10 per cent. would not really be excessive, for it may cost 10 or even 20 per cent. to move and to build or buy a new house. The Government did not disregard the rights of even the leaders of the despotic régime; and, of course, the Bagdad municipality will not and ought not to "cut" the value of poor people's property.

The anxiety of the people is not altogether without foundation. As a matter of fact the municipality, acting according to the Municipalities' Regulations, and, as a matter of urgency, recently widened certain streets and bazaars which were so narrow and crowded as to be unable to accommodate the people. In the course of the work some walls were pulled down on the ground that they "were in danger of falling into ruin," and not a farthing of compensation was paid; the engineers, seeing that the walls were bulging a little, considered them in danger of collapsing, and demolished them without compensation. In spite of this, many people, seeing that after the demolition of the walls the value of, say, their shops had increased, were grateful. But some have rightly said that their rights have been disregarded. It is true that in an architecturally perfect town which is kept in good repair, walls which "threaten collapse" ought to be demolished; but to apply this to Bagdad would mean razing the city to the ground; for even the newest walls are convex, the minarets are crooked, and the upper part of the building of Imam Ali's tomb itself is leaning. If this is the case in Bagdad, to say it "threatens to collapse" of places outside the city would mean not leaving one stone upon another—a state of affairs obviously incompatible with justice and equity. These considerations have shown the municipality that its empty coffers cannot be made to gleam by applying the "threatens collapse" rule. Now, more than ever, municipalities ought to respect the theory that he who pays the piper calls the tune. To promote the prosperity of towns is a necessity; but it is a still more urgent necessity to respect the law.

Nevertheless, the number of those who think that they have cause for complaint against the municipality is small, and it is this small number which is responsible for the cry of "threatens collapse" which is on every tongue. In order to put an end to this cry of "threatens collapse" and to trouble in the two streets which are to be opened up, the vali has formed a real property estimation commission composed of notables. Let us see what form the trouble will take now.

[44035] No. 112.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 5.)

(No. 868.)

Sir, *Pera, November 30, 1910.*

WITH reference to Sir Gerard Lowther's despatch No. 824 of the 8th instant relative to the position of the Euphrates and Tigris Navigation Company on the rivers of Mesopotamia, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith an extract from an article in the "Tanin" of the 25th instant, stating that part of the Bagdad municipal loan for 200,000*l.* (see my despatch No. 865 of yesterday's date) is to be devoted to the purchase of two steamers for the municipality.

Probably the writer of the article has in his mind the vali's scheme for a motor-boat service to Meskineh, which might perhaps bring Bagdad within twelve days of the capital, a service which would be physically impossible *viâ* Bussorah. The project was mentioned in the August and September summaries from Bagdad enclosed in Sir G. Lowther's despatches Nos. 726 and 794 of the 12th October and the 2nd November respectively.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 112.

Extract from the "Tanin" of November 25, 1910.

(Translation.)

PART of the loan is to be devoted to the purchase on behalf of the municipality of two 12-knot steamers which will bring Bagdad within twelve days' post of Constantinople.

Sir W. Willcocks maintains that these boats will not be fast enough to make way against the currents at their strongest, and that a faster boat, being of a larger tonnage, would be unable to navigate the river. Although he is most probably wrong in this idea, his words deserve reflection and experiment.

[41320] No. 113.

Foreign Office to the Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company.

Sir, *Foreign Office, December 5, 1910.*

WITH reference to my letter to you of the 31st October, I am directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to inform you that he has now received the observations of His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople on your letter of the 13th October on the subject of the interests of your company in the navigation of the rivers of Mesopotamia.

Sir G. Lowther sees little hope of success for the fusion negotiations under existing circumstances. He has several times pressed the Grand Vizier on the subject, but has invariably been met with the reply that the resolution of the Chamber of Deputies stipulated that the project should not be monopolistic in character, and that it must pass through Parliament if it involved a financial engagement for the Government. The Grand Vizier has recently invited your company's agent at Constantinople to discuss the matter with him, but Sir G. Lowther does not see how a solution of the difficulty can be attained, as under the fusion scheme a transference to the combined enterprise of the exclusive rights of the Turkish Company has always formed an integral part of your proposals. Sir G. Lowther has endeavoured to prevent the Turkish Government from granting navigation permits to private Ottomans, reminding them from time to time of their pledges given in connection with the fusion scheme, but such a negative policy has not been and in the long run cannot be availing. Sir G. Lowther has lately spoken to the Grand Vizier and to the Minister of Public Works, deprecating the reported grant of permission to Abdul Kader-el-Khedery to place two steamers on the Tigris between Bagdad and Bussorah, but has been informed by both Ministers that they have no knowledge of the matter.

Sir G. Lowther points out that the underlying idea which wrecked the fusion scheme was to throw the rivers open to the Ottoman flag by granting navigation permits, and that consequently the applicants for permits must be Ottomans. He therefore thinks it would be useless for your company, as foreigners, to apply to the Central Government for a permit to form an Ottoman company distinct from your own, to ply on the Tigris and Euphrates and their tributaries, or to send a tug and barge up the Euphrates with a view to establishing a regular service.

I am, &c.
W. LANGLEY.

[43467] No. 114.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, December 6, 1910.*

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th ultimo respecting cases of piracy in the neighbourhood of the Shatt-el-Arab, and enclosing draft of a telegram which the Earl of Crewe proposes to send to the Viceroy of India in regard to the action to be taken in the matter.

I am to state that Sir E. Grey concurs in the terms of the draft telegram enclosed in your letter under reply.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[43062] No. 115.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, December 6, 1910.*

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to transmit to you, for submission to the Earl of Crewe, copy of a despatch from His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople regarding British interests in Mesopotamia.* Mr. Marling reports further aggressive action by the Turkish local authorities of Bagdad, and states that, according to information received from His Majesty's consul-general in that city, British prestige has thereby been damaged to such an extent, that some British Indian subjects have taken steps to have themselves naturalised as Ottoman subjects, while others have declared their intention of doing so. To restore British prestige in some measure, Mr. Marling suggests that His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" should be instructed to visit Zakhmuniyeh to ascertain whether any Turkish gendarmes are still on the island, and to create an impression on the local Arab population.

I am to state that Sir E. Grey concurs in the advisability of taking this step, and, subject to the assent of the Earl of Crewe, would propose to request the Admiralty to issue the necessary telegraphic instructions in order that the suggested visit to Zakhmuniyeh may be made.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[44509] No. 116.

Sir Edward Grey to Mr. Marling.

(No. 337.)

(Telegraphic.) R. *Foreign Office, December 8, 1910.*

YOUR despatch No. 813 of the 23rd ultimo.

Lynch hears that demolition of premises has commenced on 1st December, and that only £ T. 508 plus 20 per cent. has been deposited by authorities, whereas claim agreed to by consul-general is £ T. 2,396.

Can you do anything?

[44629] No. 117.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 9.)

(No. 255.)

(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, December 9, 1910.*

BAGDAD demolitions.

Pending the result of the protest filed by Lynch, it seems to me impossible to take any action in Constantinople with regard to the proceedings referred to in your telegram No. 337 of yesterday, because the premises in question are being demolished under the Expropriation Law, and the authorities are not in this case, as in that of the first demolitions, invoking the municipal regulation regarding buildings in danger of collapse.

[44638] No. 118.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 9.)

(No. 256.)

(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, December 9, 1910.*

ARAB disturbances at Catraneh and Kerak.

His Majesty's consul at Damascus reports that the town of Kerak is menaced with

* No. 105.

attack by a force composed of Arabs and Druses to the number of 1,500 men, and that a body of Arabs attacked the Hedjaz Railway on the 5th instant, killed the station-master of Catranch, and cut the line.

He adds that the departure of the conscript soldiers is the cause of this outbreak.

[44587] No. 119.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(*Received December* 9.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of the Earl of Crewe, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of enclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 17th November, 1910, relative to the Turkish authorities and the Sheikh of Koweit.

India Office, December 8, 1910.

Enclosure 1 in No. 119.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cox to Government of India.

(Confidential.) *Bushire, October* 30, 1910.

IN amplification of my telegram dated the 28th October, 1910, I have the honour to submit copies of the letters in which the new Vali of Bussorah, Hussein Jelal Bey, makes to the sheikh, and the latter politely rejects an offer of a salary of 400*l.* per annum as Kaimakam of Koweit, payable monthly.

Enclosure 2 in No. 119.

Vali of Bussorah to Sheikh Mubarek.

(Confidential.) *Bussorah, October* 11, 1910.

AFTER greeting and enquiries after you, I beg to state that, as it is not hidden from you, a certain quantity of dates had formerly been allotted to the Kaimakam of Koweit as an annual stipend. As the form of government has changed recently and a constitutional era has dawned, the aforesaid annual stipend of dates has been converted into a monthly salary amounting to 3,333 piastres, and this is intended for the Kaimakam of Koweit (*lit.*, this is in the name of).

Under these circumstances, please let me know from which source you wish to receive the above-mentioned salary, whether from the Treasury at Fao or from the central province, so that the necessary draft may be granted for it.

Salaams to you and God's mercy and blessings be upon you.

Enclosure 3 in No. 119.

Sheikh Mubarek to the Vali of Bussorah.

(Confidential.) *Koweit, October* 18, 1910.

AFTER paying deep respects to your Excellency, I beg to state that I had the honour to receive your august order dated the 7th Shawal, 1328, in which you state that the annual stipend of a quantity of dates granted by the High Government to the Sheikhs of Koweit was a reward for our financial and physical services according to the contents of the Royal firman, and that, as the form of government has changed, it has been converted into a monthly salary of 3,333 piastres. Let it be known to your Excellency that this stipend was abandoned years ago, and that we

continue to pay devotion and render services honorarily. So I see no necessity to trouble the Treasury, and you will, Inshallah, constantly find me punctual in doing services. I have a strong hope that you will always pay me your high regards, and, in any case, the command and decision rest with your Excellency.

Enclosure 4 in No. 119.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cox to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Sir, *Bushire, November* 6, 1910.

WITH reference to my telegram dated the 27th October, 1910, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of a letter since received from the political agent, Koweit, regarding the attachment by the Turks of the date-crop on the Fadaghia property belonging to Sheikh Mubarek and the measures taken by the latter to secure the removal of the attachment, already briefly reported in my telegram above mentioned.

2. The attitude of the Bussorah authorities towards this question is another of the factors which combine to bring me to the opinion expressed in my telegram dated the 2nd November, 1910, that the present position is "impossible," and Captain Shakespear's views as expressed in this present communication have my entire concurrence.

I have, &c.

P. Z. COX,

Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.

Enclosure 5 in No. 119.

Captain Shakespear to Lieutenant-Colonel Cox.

(Confidential.)

Sir, *Koweit, October* 25, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to invite a reference to the correspondence regarding Sheikh Mubarek's Fadaghia property ending with your second assistant's endorsement, dated the 19th October, 1910.

2. As you met the sheikh at Mohammerah in person no answer is required to the query addressed to me in Captain Crosthwaite's endorsement dated the 4th October, 1910, to which I have not been able to reply earlier owing to the sheikh's absence from Koweit.

3. Since his return, however, I have discussed the subject with the sheikh, and it appears that, subsequent to his meeting with you and after the dispatch of your telegram of the 14th October to the Secretary of State, attachment of the date-crop at Fadaghia was actually carried out, a number of Turkish soldiers being posted in the garden and all shipments stopped. The sheikh tells me that he then again sent his secretary to the new vali pointing out the injustice of the procedure in view of the fact known to all that the property really belonged to Sheikh Mubarek, that he was ready to pay the revenue due, and, indeed, that though prepared to do so for a long time, the offer had been declined by the Turkish authorities. Finally, the sheikh informs me, the revenue was actually accepted and a receipt passed for the amount, citing that the "revenue for the Fadaghia property standing in the name of Ayesha Khanum had been received from the hand of Abdul Aziz-bin-Salim-bin-Badr." The sheikh seemed pleased with this subterfuge, and said that the attachment was then immediately removed by order of the vali.

4. It was of very urgent importance that the attachment should be raised as early as possible, and the sheikh may have cause for self-congratulation in having effected it by his own unaided efforts; but it is impossible to avoid the reflection that, as a solution of a very important question involving ultimately the whole status of Koweit, it is an exceedingly poor substitute for the recognition of "Koweiti" as a distinct nationality, distinct, that is to say, from Turkish. The difficulty has been tided over for the present, but the sheikh is still left exposed to the machinations of the Turkish officials at Bussorah, and is still unrecognised officially as the rightful owner of the property.

5. In submitting this report, I have the honour to solicit your utmost support in

recommending to His Majesty's Government that no really permanent solution of the difficulty is possible until at least the recognition of "Koweiti" as a distinct and separate nationality has been obtained from the Turkish Government. The sheikh again expressed his faith and reliance on British support, but considering his age and the extent to which his patience has already been tried in this far-reaching matter, and one which at present also so closely affects his pocket, it is, in my humble opinion, one deserving of the most urgent consideration, if His Majesty's Government still attaches importance to the maintenance of our special position in Koweit and to the possibilities of the port, both commercially and strategically, in the near future.

I have, &c.
W. H. I. SHAKESPEAR,
Political Agent, Koweit.

[44632] No. 120.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received December 9.)

Sir, *India Office, December 9, 1910.*

WITH reference to paragraph 5 of your letter of the 5th October last, I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to forward, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, copy of a telegram from the Government of India regarding the suggested conclusion of a treaty with the Sheikh or Sheikhs of Katr.

With regard to the general question of our relations with Turkey in those regions which this telegram raises, I am to say that the Earl of Crewe shares the views of his predecessor, as indicated in my letters of the 7th and 28th October last.

So far as the particular question of treaties with the Katr tribes is concerned, his Lordship agrees with the Government of India that no advantage would accrue from them (from the point of view of our relations with Turkey) unless the Turks can be induced to confine themselves to their recognised possessions in El Katif. And as it would appear that if and when the Turks have been induced so to confine themselves the treaties will, from the international point of view, be no longer necessary, there seems to be no advantage in pursuing the discussion in the present connection.

I am to take this opportunity of acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 6th instant regarding Turkish aggression on British interests in Mesopotamia. In reply, I am to say that though Lord Crewe would prefer—for the reasons given in my letters above referred to—a comprehensive settlement of our differences with Turkey, in the circumstances he readily assents to the proposal that His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" should visit the island of Zakhumiyeh. He does not, however, imagine that the mere visit of the ship will restore British prestige in any appreciable measure, and he would suggest that—if this result is thought necessary—any Turkish soldiers or flags that may be found on the island should be removed; or that the "Redbreast" should at least be accompanied by such other ships as can be spared from the blockade, and should cruise to the head of the Gulf and remain as long as possible in that neighbourhood.

In conclusion, I am to say that Lord Crewe has learned with deep regret from the enclosures in your letter that British Indian subjects have found it necessary to change their nationality in the circumstances described. This fact cannot fail to create a most unfortunate impression in India, and constitutes a further argument—if such be needed—for the firm and comprehensive policy that was indicated in Sir E. Grey's despatch of the 17th October, and advocated in the interests of India in this Office letter of the 28th October.

I am, &c.
R. RITCHIE.

Enclosure in No. 120.

Government of India to the Earl of Crewe.

(Telegraphic.) P. *December 1, 1910.*

FOLLOWING reply received from resident, Persian Gulf, whom we have consulted on question raised in your telegram dated the 6th October as to El Katr:—

"I find it difficult to discuss question at present juncture apart from general situation in the Gulf as between Great Britain and Turkey.

"His Majesty's consul at Bussorah informs me, in a letter which has just reached me, that, in reply to an enquiry as to what action had been taken by him in regard to Zakhumiyeh, the new vali challenged consul's right to discuss matter either privately or officially, saying that the island was Turkish territory. The vali went on to express his astonishment at the consul's not minding his own concerns, *i.e.*, commerce. This makes it evident that no effect has been produced by the communication in regard to recent incidents which have been made to the Turkish Government; an impossible and humiliating position has, it seems to me, been created, and it is inevitable that unpleasant incidents will frequently recur unless the atmosphere is quickly cleared. With the Young Turk régime the temporising policy which we have pursued for years past will not, it seems to be generally agreed, serve the purpose; it is submitted that strong and imperative grounds for settling issues now are afforded us by assertive attitude of Turks and recent attempts to upset *status quo*.

"What is needed to clear the air is, from a local standpoint, as follows:—

"1. Our agreement with Koweit should cease to be kept secret, and our intention to make the agreement effective should be intimated to the Turkish Government. I strongly recommend that anomaly of Turkish flag at Koweit should simultaneously be eliminated, if this can be done.

"2. Turks should be induced to confine themselves to their recognised possessions at Katif and Ojair; mudirates at Wakra, &c., should be finally abolished; and withdrawal of Turkish military posts from Jinnah, Um Kasr, Bubiyan, Zakhumiyeh, and El Bidan should be brought about by us.

"3. Item No. 2 having been achieved, treaties should be concluded by us with Bin Thani, and, if necessary, with other headmen on the west coast of Katr, on the lines of the trucial coast agreements.

"It is beyond my purview to deal with question whether coercive measures will be necessary to achieve the above ends, or whether it is possible to achieve them by means of comprehensive reciprocal compromise. I beg to say, however, that there is no *quid pro quo* in this sphere that I can conceive which could be offered to the Turkish Government in exchange for withdrawal of pretensions of Turkey. In some other sphere it might perhaps be possible to find such a *quid pro quo*.

"Should it be necessary to resort to measures of coercion, so favourable a juncture locally as now exists could not be expected ever to recur. Under scheme of Nazim Pasha for concentrating troops at Bagdad, the numerical strength of the military posts in question has just been reduced to a minimum; while it would be a simple matter for us to make a naval demonstration owing to the fact that we have a strong squadron in the Gulf in connection with the arms traffic.

"It seems essential that action should be taken now if achievement of above measures is ever to be brought about; such achievement would completely consolidate our position on Arab coast and in the Gulf generally, especially in regard to the question of pearl fishery. Task may be rendered very difficult, if not impossible, in the event of action being delayed, by the suggested association of Turkey with the Triple Alliance and increase of Turkish navy. In these circumstances, I respectfully urge the necessity in any case that, by one method or another, position with Turkey should forthwith be adjusted, and chronic elements of friction, which have now become dangerous, should be eliminated. I consider, on grounds explained above, that, unless we are prepared to conclude treaty openly, and to bring about, as suggested in item No. 2 above, the elimination of Turkish influence from Katr, the conclusion of a treaty with Bin Thani would now be useless. Existence of treaty would only be a source of danger to the Thani family from the present Turkish régime, and they themselves would fight shy of it, unless such action were taken simultaneously."

We share the view of the resident that, unless Turks can be induced to confine themselves to their recognised possessions at Ojair and Katif, treaties with chiefs of Katr would lead to no advantage, and, moreover, that chiefs would probably not now agree to enter into treaties.

[44657] No. 121.

The Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to Foreign Office.—(Received December 10.)

3, *Salter's Hall Court, Cannon Street, London,*
December 9, 1910.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 5th instant on the subject of the navigation of the rivers of Mesopotamia. In our despatch, to which this is a reply, my board enumerated the various courses which in their opinion it was open to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople to pursue, in order to safeguard the interests of our company and of British trade. It is, therefore, with feelings of regret and grave apprehension for the future that my board take note of the fact that his Excellency does not see his way under existing circumstances to adopt any of these courses, and that the situation is one of drift.

As regards permits, if His Majesty's Ambassador should find himself powerless to prevent the infringement of the *status quo* by the grant of permits to private Ottomans, my board suggest that it would be advisable to clear up the situation as regards the participation of foreign capital in such enterprises. Is such capital admissible, and is it open to the Ottoman holder of a permit to form an Ottoman company with the participation of foreigners? If the answer be in the affirmative, are we excluded from participation, and on what grounds? If, in the negative, British interests would be protected by such a declaration as, if given in a formal way, the advent of German capital in the guise of an Ottoman company would be rendered difficult.

I have, &c.
H. W. MACLEAN, *Secretary.*

[44656] No. 122.

The Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to Foreign Office.—(Received December 10.)

3, *Salters' Hall Court, Cannon Street, E.C.,*
December 9, 1910.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo on the subject of our claim for a refund of duty on our steamer the "Julnar."

You appear to be under the belief that the precedent of 1877 stands by itself. This is not the case. We have never paid duty on any of our steamers on the Tigris, and, if we were compelled to pay duty on the "Julnar," a precedent would be created which would not only considerably diminish the value of our rights, but would also impair those rights as a whole. We therefore trust that His Majesty's Government will take energetic steps to protect us in this question and to recover the duty. Such a course is the more essential owing to the unfriendly way in which the Turkish Government have recently treated British interests in connection with the development of the navigation.

I have, &c.
H. W. MACLEAN, *Secretary.*

[44777] No. 123.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 11.)

(No. 259.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, December 11, 1910.*

I LEARN from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad that Admiral Commanding Indian Station has expressed a desire to visit that place.

In view of attitude of vali, Mr. Lorimer states he considers Admiral's arrival at present inexpedient, and I entirely concur in that opinion.

[44776] No. 123*.

Sir G. Lowther to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 11.)

(No. 258.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, December 11, 1910.*

HEDJAZ.

His Majesty's consul at Damascus reports the murder of the chief officials at Kerak and of a number of soldiers by the Mogiali Arabs, in revenge for the recent decision to withhold the yearly subvention granted to them for guarding the railway.

The line has, according to information received by the French Embassy, been destroyed for some kilometres' distance.

[44790] No. 124.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(*Received December* 12.)

(No. 879.)

Sir, *Constantinople, December* 7, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 859 of the 24th ultimo, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Bussorah on the subject of the attack on the Mishri property at Fedaghia.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure 1 in No. 124.

Consul Crow to Mr. Marling.

(No. 65.)

Sir, *Bussorah, November* 7, 1910.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 61 of the 26th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith, for your Excellency's information, copies of a despatch and letter received from His Majesty's acting consul at Mohammerah.

I have, &c.

F. E. CROW.

Enclosure 2 in No. 124.

Acting Consul Wilson to Consul Crow.

Mohammerah, November 1, 1910.

A COPY of the undermentioned communication is forwarded to His Majesty's consul, Bussorah, for information, with the compliments of the undersigned.

A. T. WILSON, *Lieutenant.*

Acting Consul Wilson to Consul-General Cox.

Sir, *Mohammerah, November* 1, 1910.

In continuation of the correspondence ending with my No. 1214 of the 29th instant, I have the honour to forward further correspondence on the subject of the attack on the Fedaghia lands of the Mishri family.

As regards Enclosure 3, the letter from the Vali of Bussorah to the Sheikh, I have told Mirza Hamza, who is unofficially in charge here during the absence of the sheikh at Nasiri, to issue orders for the arrest of all the persons named by the vali, as well as of any others who may be suspected of complicity: those who are Turkish subjects to be handed over to the Turkish authorities in due course, those who are Persian subjects, or in regard to whose nationality there is any doubt, to be imprisoned by the sheikh at Fuilieh.

I have also recommended the sheikh to apply officially to the vali for the surrender of the men wanted in connection with the Koweit piracy case of the 29th June, 1910, at the same time as he sends his reply to the above letter.

Mirza Hamza informs me that most of the persons named in the vali's letter are not in Persian territory, but have taken refuge with Sheikh Naghaiinish at Ma'amir and elsewhere in Turkish territory. In some cases, notably that of Haji Sultan's son, he altogether disbelieves the allegations made by the vali, and also points out the great discrepancy between the quantities of dates alleged to have been taken to Persian territory compared with the quantities alleged to have been taken to points on the Turkish side of the river.

The sheikh is not likely to be back in Mohammerah for at least a fortnight, and until he returns it is improbable that very much will be done. Mirza Hamza is afraid to take active measures himself, as he fears that the new vali may raise the question, mentioned not long ago by Sulemman Nazif Bey, of his status as a Turkish subject, and seek to seize his property in Bussorah on the ground that he has become a servant of a

foreign Government. Such action would probably be quite illegal, but the possibility is enough to hamper Mirza Hamza's freedom of action considerably.

I am sending copies of this letter to His Majesty's Minister, Tehran, His Majesty's consul, Bussorah, and the political agent, Koweit.

I have, &c.

A. T. WILSON, *Lieutenant.*

Enclosure 3 in No. 124.

Vali of Bussorah to the Sheikh of Mohammerah.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

Bussorah, November 2, 1910.

[*Note.*—From the numbering of this letter it is plain that it was written subsequent to the 23rd Shaval, as letters of that date bear a lower number than this letter.]

I REGRET to inform you that from enquiries I have made it appears that on Tuesday night, on the 6th of the Turkish month, the following occurrence took place at 8:30 Arabic.

Ma'tuk Khashnam, a fellah of Mishri, of a tribe living opposite Ma'awiyeh, with the assistance of your dependents Bukhakh and his son Sa'adun, Nazir, Ma'tuk, Abdi, Hussein-ibn-Haji Sultan, also Hamad-ibn-Abud, of Ma'awiyeh, Ishak-ibn-Jauhar, Hajin-ibn-Abdullah Khashnam, Aslan-ibn-Uhab, Abid Rabba, Karaim-ibn-Atiyeh, S'ad-ibn-Ahmed Sa'id, and their companions, together with the former fellahs of Mohammed Mishri, and accompanied by 1,000 armed and a like number of unarmed men, attacked the lands of Mohammed-el-Mishri, which are known as Hajiyah, in the district of Fedaghia. They brought 500 bellems and lighters with them.

They cut the telegraph wire first of all: then they commenced to fire at Nazir-bin-Faraj, the agent of Mohammed Mishri, and the watchmen who were with him, and forced them to fly in terror. They went to the Turkish police post in Dawasir and took refuge.

After the attack 150 karas of dates were taken from the Hajiyah lands of Mohammed-bin-Mishri and 150 karas from the Ma'awiyeh portion, 110 karas from the wakf portion, 140 karas from the Abid portion.

Under the superintendence of one of your dependents these quantities were taken across the river. Nazir-ibn-Mutraj, one of your dependents, took the dates he had stolen to Manyuhi.

Abdi, Hussein-ibn-Haji Sultan, Karaim-ibn-Ahyab and Ishak-ibn-Jauhar, with their friends, took the stolen dates to Kusbat-al-Nassar.

Najim-ibn-Abdullah Khashnam, a fellah of Mohammed-ibn-Mishri, took the dates he had stolen to Dawaib on Turkish soil.

Abdul Rabby took 500 tins of syrup of dates to your side of the river and has not been seen since.

Mutraj and Khashnam took a mare and 130 liras and 50 rupees, and various articles of value, and went to Kusbat-al-Nassar.

Ma'tuk-al-Khashnam, a fellah whom Mishri had evicted, took 20 karas from the Khashnam lands, and went to Ma'amir in Turkish territory.

Karaim-ibn-Ahyab and Atiyah-ibn-Mohammed and Fahad and Ibrahim-ibn-Rashid, Musa-ibn-Na'amah, Mohammed-ibn-Mutrad, all former fellahs of Mishri, and evicted by him, took 120 karas of dates and 20 tins of syrup of dates from the Karaim lands, and fled to Nazir Mutrak's house in Manuyhi; 180 karas were taken from the Ahyab lands with 60 tins of date syrup, and removed to Manuyhi and Kusbat-al-Nassar. Part of this batch is in the house of Ibn-Hamdi, in Koweit; he is the agent of Sheikh Kubarek and of Ahmed Pasha Zohair.

From the lands of Ishak 180 karas were taken to Thaamir and Manyuhi and Kusbat-al-Nassar.

The loot of Mahmud-ibn-Salman, of Ma'awiyeh, and his friends, and of those who are the fellahs of Salih-bin-Ibrahim, amounted to 60 karas of dates and 30 tins of date syrup; all this was taken to Dorah in Turkish territory.

Anhur and Karaim and the fellahs of Abdullah-bin-Mishri took from the lands of Karaim 30 karas of dates and 20 tins of date syrup; all this was taken to Manyuhi.

The total looted, according to the above list, was: Dates, 1,190 karas; syrup of dates, 785 tins; also 120 liras and 50 rupees.

Such occurrences and unprovoked disturbances are a source of great sorrow to me, and are really almost incredible in these times.

There is no doubt your Excellency does not approve of such deeds, and, indeed, no one of any sense would do so.

The matter is of the highest importance, and is a cause of great disturbance to the public peace and safety, which it is the duty of both of us to safeguard.

I would ask you to give this matter your careful attention, and give strict orders to the insurgents named above to be seized and handed over to me to be dealt with judicially.

Also please have the stolen property, which has been deposited in your territories, handed over to me without delay.

I have taken steps to lay hands on stolen property found in Turkish territory.

Enclosure 4 in No. 124.

Acting Consul Wilson to Consul Crow.

My dear Crow,

Mohammerah, October 29, 1910.

I AM informed by the local authorities here that, according to a report received to-day from Haji Sultan, the "Marmaris," during her stay at Fao (Wednesday evening to Friday evening), dropped a mark in the river between herself and the Persian shore, just opposite some huts occupied by pearlers, known as Sa'adun, and commenced rifle practice at it. Almost all the bullets went far over the mark, and forced the occupants of the huts to fly. Bellems going up and down the bank had to stop, and sailing-vessels in the vicinity were much inconvenienced. No one was hit, fortunately, as all in the vicinity of the said mark had the good sense to fly for their lives.

It seems probable that the commander of the "Marmaris" did this in order to induce someone to fire back at him, which would have given him an excuse to open fire with his guns.

I do not suppose for a moment that the Vali of Bussorah has cognisance of such pranks, but I inform you of them in case you may see an opportunity of bringing them to his notice. Rifle practice in a narrow river devoted to international commerce is surely reprehensible, apart from any other consideration, in view of the dense population on either bank. I am in possession of specimen bullets.

A copy of this goes this mail to Bushire.

Yours sincerely,

A. T. WILSON, *Lieutenant.*

[44794]

No. 125.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 12.)

(No. 883.)

Constantinople, December 7, 1910.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Smyrna, reporting on the present condition of affairs at Samos.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 125.

Consul-General Barnham to Mr. Marling.

(No. 100. Confidential.)

Smyrna, December 3, 1910.

Sir,

IN view of the agitation which has been carried on in the Greek press against the Prince of Samos, and of the numerous complaints which I understand have been addressed to His Majesty's Embassy impugning the legality of his acts, I beg to state in the following report the impression as to the merits of this controversy which I received during my recent visit to Samos.

Before leaving Smyrna I reflected that as there were several prisoners at Vathy

awaiting trial, and the political atmosphere was still very much disturbed, I would do well to take care that the object of my visit was not misinterpreted.

I therefore wrote to Mr. Mare, requesting him to say nothing of my intention beforehand, and that while I was at Vathy he should inform all enquirers that my visit was personal to himself, and that I would receive no one, nor answer any letter or petition which might be addressed to me on political matters.

But from the moment of my arrival at Samos I was under no disillusion as to the view which the Prince took of my presence in the island.

I met Kopassi Bey several times, when he never failed to entertain me with a history of his administration and to impress upon me the absolute legality of his acts.

On one occasion Kopassi Bey invited me to an official dinner to meet the senators, the commander of the Turkish stationnaire, and the officer commanding the troops.

After dinner the senators took me aside and entered into a long panegyric of the Prince, praising him especially for the steps he had taken to prevent the adulteration of wine and to rescue the agricultural population from the grip of the usurer by the foundation of an agricultural bank.

As they talked, however, I saw the Prince looking on from a distance with an approving eye, and I knew that the proceedings had been rehearsed beforehand.

There were reasons why I think that Mr. Mare, though an excellent consular officer, is unable to express himself freely and fearlessly on the subject of Prince Kopassi. In the first place, he has been expressly forbidden to mix himself up in the politics of the island, even so far as to accept petitions, and, secondly, for reasons of business it is naturally to his interest not to offend the Prince. He would not be likely to formulate a definite charge against the Prince unless he felt absolutely certain of obtaining his removal, and the same remark applies to the vice-consuls of the other Powers.

Whatever be the truth as to the accusations brought against Kopassi Bey, it is quite natural that Mr. Mare should be biassed in favour of the political prisoners and exiles. He has himself been brought up in this atmosphere of turmoil and intrigue, has seen a long succession of governors driven from the island by political agitators, and must have begun to feel that resistance to constituted authority was a venial offence.

The family of Sofoulis, the leader of the revolt in 1908, who is now in exile and under sentence of death, are the friends and neighbours of Mr. Mare, and, influenced by natural sympathy for them, he suggests that Sofoulis should be pardoned and allowed to return. Yet he one day convinced me by a striking illustration that this man, whose party Kopassi Bey has so signally defeated, is an unscrupulous and dangerous character.

We passed on the high road a gentleman whom Mr. Mare informed me was a man whom, for political reasons, Sofoulis had sent to prison for ten years on a trumped-up charge of having embezzled a few hundred piastres.

I will now turn to the elections which took place in Samos last July, and the illegalities which are alleged to have been committed in connection therewith.

I saw, at the vice-consulate, a number of petitions and letters which Mr. Mare received at that time, but which he had not forwarded to me in view of the instructions which he received from my predecessor in the terms of the late Ambassador's despatch of the 2nd September, 1907.

As each one tells more or less the same story, I will give a summary of the whole.

It is alleged that the elections which were held on the 7th July last were invalidated by the Prince, because his own nominees had been rejected, and that fresh elections, at which soldiers and gendarmes coerced the electors, were held at those places on the 28th July.

This occurred at the port of Vathy, Upper Vathy, Chora Marathocampo, Pagondo, Thea, Mavrodjea, Corvina, Spatharion, and Kontakoikon.

The petitions bear numerous signatures—indeed, most of them state that they form a majority of the electorate.

I have discussed this matter with Europeans at Samos and people in Smyrna who have visited Samos since those events, and no one questions the fact that soldiers and gendarmes were employed at the second election, and that they probably did coerce the electors.

It is also true that at the past election a deliberate attempt was made to overthrow the Prince's authority by the introduction of armed bands, who cut the telephone wires, overcame the gendarmes, and compelled people to vote for these politicians who have been checkmated by the second election and are now crying out against the tyranny of Kopassi Bey.

The Samians have no fear of the gendarmes, who are their own people, but they have a wholesome dread of a Turkish soldier, especially since the fight at Vathy in 1908, and the mere presence of soldiers at the election was enough to make them run away.

I may here mention that there are now only two companies of infantry at Samos, and that they appear to be well-behaved.

After the second election the disappointed candidates met at Carlovassi, and at the instigation of Nicolaides, ex-deputy of Vathy, they sent an ultimatum to the Prince that if he did not recognise their election the people would take up arms. For this act of sedition Nicolaides and others are now under arrest awaiting trial.

In order to prevent a repetition of abuses at the elections the Assembly has passed a law that elections shall not be held on the same day all over the island, but at each place on a separate day, no doubt because the military force is insufficient to preserve order in many districts at the same time.

Kopassi Bey seems to have had the support of the Imperial Government throughout.

When the Greek papers speak of his rule as tyranny, and of the state of the island as one of anarchy, they do not tell the truth. I travelled over a good part of the island, and found it perfectly tranquil, and I should say that with many, and certainly the agricultural classes, the Prince is popular.

On the one hand, we have Kopassi Bey, loyal to the Porte, and, I believe, sincerely anxious to improve the condition of the island, and, on the other, these firebrand politicians, who enter into public life solely to serve their own private interests by securing the best posts in the Government and if possible monopolies of trade; but in order to do so the Prince must be their accomplice, and if that cannot be, they decide that by hook or by crook the Prince must go.

They are mostly lawyers and doctors who have obtained their diplomas in Athens, and are full of the spirit of Hellenism, and I think it fortunate for the Porte that they should, during this very critical period, have as governor at Samos a man of iron will whom they can trust, and who has certainly created order out of disorder in the face of great difficulties.

Kopassi Bey told me that he did not enjoy his position and would prefer to return to Constantinople, where he might enter the Cabinet as Minister of Commerce or Public Works. The fact is that he is a little afraid that he may be assassinated, and for this reason does not expose himself very much.

It is said that he never shows himself at the windows of his palace lest one of his enemies should take it into his head to shoot him, and he never travels without a large escort.

However, so long as he has sufficient courage to remain at Samos I hope we shall support him, for the day he goes and a man of milder stamp succeeds him the whole question will reopen.

Mr. Mare begs me to recommend that a general amnesty should be granted. He thinks it would be good policy, and that the lesson which these malcontents have received at Kopassi Bey's hands is enough to ensure their good behaviour in the future.

I think it would be premature to do so, but if, and whenever it is granted, it should not be without the Prince's consent.

I cannot picture Sofoulis and Kopassi Bey breathing the same atmosphere.

There are, however, matters connected with the judiciary which are open to criticism. Political prisoners are kept too long awaiting trial. As an example I may quote the case of Nicolaides, the ex-deputy of Vathy, who made the famous escapade to Constantinople last August with the object of obtaining the Prince's removal. This man was committed to prison on his return in August and has not yet been tried.

I think two months ought to be ample for the courts to prepare their case against a prisoner, and that their trial ought not to be longer delayed.

Difficulties are also raised as to prisoners seeing their friends.

It is also, I think, desirable that the judge of the criminal court should not be a Samiote, as he is likely to be prejudiced against the prisoner for political reasons.

In conclusion, I think that the task of the Prince of Samos is peculiarly difficult, and he should not be judged too harshly if for the purpose of saving the island from disorder he in some matters transgresses the letter of the law.

It is impossible not to draw a comparison between Samos and the other islands of the archipelago greatly to the advantage of the latter, which have always shown greater stability, and prospered even under the rule of the late Sultan.

I have, &c.

HENRY D. BARNHAM.

[44629] No. 126.

Foreign Office to Messrs. Lynch Brothers.

Gentlemen, *Foreign Office, December* 12, 1910.

WITH reference to the telegram communicated to this department by Mr. H. Lynch on the 7th instant, stating that the demolition of your office at Bagdad had been begun, I am directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to inform you that he telegraphed to His Majesty's chargé d'affaires detailing the circumstances and enquiring whether he could take any action in the matter.

In reply, Mr. Marling has pointed out that the demolition of these premises is being carried out in virtue of the expropriation law and not, as in former cases, under municipal regulations regarding buildings alleged to be threatening collapse. He therefore sees no possibility of taking action at Constantinople pending the result of the protests against the demolition which it is presumed have been made by your agents.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[44777] No. 127.

Foreign Office to Admiralty.

(Confidential.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, December* 13, 1910.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to transmit to you, for the information of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, copy of a telegram from His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople, respecting a proposed visit to Bagdad by the commander-in-chief on the East Indian station.*

I am to state that, in view of the present attitude of the Turkish local authorities, Sir E. Grey concurs in the view expressed by Mr. Marling and His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad that the visit is at present to be deprecated.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[44632] No. 128.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, December* 14, 1910.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, respecting the attitude of the Turkish local authorities at Bagdad and in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf.

I am to state that Sir E. Grey agrees with the Earl of Crewe that it would be useless to conclude treaties with the Katr sheiklis; and with reference to the question of naval action at Zakhunnieh or elsewhere, I am to transmit to you, for Lord Crewe's information, copy of a letter to the Admiralty.†

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[44632] No. 129.

Foreign Office to Admiralty.

Sir, *Foreign Office, December* 14, 1910.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to transmit to you, for submission to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, the enclosed printed copy of a despatch from His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople,‡ respecting the

* No. 123 † No. 127. ‡ No. 105.

unsatisfactory attitude towards British interests of the Turkish local authorities at Bagdad and in the regions adjoining the Persian Gulf.

It will be seen from this despatch that Mr. Marling has suggested that His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" should visit the island of Zakhunnieh, between Bahrein and the mainland. In regard to this island, I am to explain that, though the ownership of the island is claimed by the Sheikh of Bahrein, the Turkish authorities have on more than one occasion recently sent soldiers and gendarmes thither, who have hoisted the Turkish flag in violation of the existing *status quo*.

The India Office, to whom the matter has been referred, agree to Mr. Marling's suggestion, but propose that, in order to more effectually restore British prestige, any Turkish soldiers or flags that may be found on the island of Zakhunnieh should be removed, or that the "Redbreast" should at least be accompanied by such other ships as can be spared from the blockading squadron on the Persian coast, and should cruise to the head of the Gulf and remain as long as possible in that neighbourhood. Sir E. Grey sees no objection to this procedure, nor to the removal of Turkish soldiers or flags from the island of Zakhunnieh if any should be found there, but I am in the first place to enquire whether the Lords Commissioners consider that any ships can be spared from the blockading squadron to accompany His Majesty's ship "Redbreast." On receipt of a reply on this point Sir E. Grey will consult further with the Lords Commissioners as to what instructions it may be advisable should be issued to the naval officer commanding.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[45287] No. 130.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received December 15.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of the Earl of Crewe, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated 9th December, relative to piracies in the Persian Gulf.

India Office, December 14, 1910.

Enclosure in No. 130.

The Earl of Crewe to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P. *India Office, December* 9, 1910.

PIRACIES in Persian Gulf. Please refer to your telegram dated the 18th ultimo.

His Majesty's Government are of opinion that, as a new vali has now been appointed, there should be co-operation between Crow and Wilson with a view to the urgent need for enquiry being pressed upon him. Surrender of culprits to Sheikh of Mohammerah, or to us on his behalf, should be asked for, if it is established that they are the sheikh's subjects.

Need in the future for preventive measures, rather than punitive measures, is emphasised by present difficulties. Arrangements for patrolling by His Majesty's ships have, I understand, now been made by Resident, Persian Gulf.

[45339] No. 131.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 15.)

(No. 260.)

(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, December* 15, 1910.

ADMIRAL'S visit to Bagdad.

I have received a telegram from Admiral Slade, stating that he is prepared to put off the visit which, as reported in my telegram No. 259 of the 11th instant, he had intended to make to Bagdad.

[45488] No. 132.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 261.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, December 16, 1910.*

YEMEN. His Majesty's vice-consul at Hodeidah confirms the rumours current of renewed troubles in the Yemen, and telegraphs that while every night firing is being carried on by the Arabs on Sanaa, it is rumoured at Hodeidah that Said Idris intends rising in the plains and the Imam in the mountains, after the pilgrimage, which is ending now.

[45653] No. 133.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 19.)

(No. 888.)
Sir, *Constantinople, December 11, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Erzeroum, enclosing copy of a despatch from Mr. Safrastian, reporting on the attitude of Ismail Hakki Bey, acting vali of Bitlis, and giving instances of Kurdish lawlessness.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure 1 in No. 133.

Consul McGregor to Mr. Marling.

(No. 95.)
Sir, *Erzeroum, November 29, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch addressed to me by Mr. Safrastian, acting vice-consul at Bitlis, reporting on the attitude of the acting vali and various instances of Kurdish lawlessness.

I have, &c.
P. J. C. McGREGOR.

Enclosure 2 in No. 133.

Acting Vice-Consul Safrastian to Consul McGregor.

Sir, *Bitlis, November 19, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to report that it is now one month and a-half since Ismail Hakki Bey, the acting vali, has reached here, and notwithstanding the hopes entertained as regards his good intentions, there is reason to state positively that with the exception of hopeful promises and plans of future activity he has effected nothing for the peaceful regeneration of this province, and that the conditions have generally not much improved as compared with those under Tahir Pasha, his predecessor.

A fortnight ago the acting vali visited the Nahie of Tchukur, five hours from here, to study on the place the agrarian problem, which has never lost its acute character.

According to a trustworthy source, Ismail Hakki Bey, addressing Armenians and Kurds of the Nahie, told them in a violent language that "he would sacrifice himself as a 'fedai' in defence of the rights of peasantry, and that he would blow up with dynamite usurpers and oppressors like Hajhi Nedjmeddine Effendi of Bitlis." He has, however, done nothing, at least up to the moment of writing, to justify in the least his fiery speech at Tchukur.

Soon after his arrival here, the acting vali told me that he would not be able to do much without "full powers" being granted to him for a speedy settlement of agrarian and other questions. In the meantime, a rumour was persistently current to the effect that his Excellency had applied at Constantinople for permission to proclaim a state of siege throughout this vilayet for the disarmament of population, a step which in my humble opinion would rather be directed against Christians than Moslems, repeating

the same outrageous abuses upon Christians in this province as they seem to have lately perpetrated upon Macedonian Bulgars and Greeks.

I had another long talk with him six days ago. It appeared to me that his frame of mind and dispositions were quite different from those which he displayed on previous occasions. He stated that he was at liberty to act as freely as he thought it expedient, that he could proclaim a state of siege when he saw any necessity, upon which I remarked that even without having recourse to such an extreme measure, which might raise all sorts of comment and complaints, the patriotic good-will of authorities should be sufficient to remove most of the present wrongs and grievances. He repeated his cherished phrase that he is still studying the state of affairs as prevailing at present in this vilayet, and that everything should have been put right by the time of his departure from here. He confesses at the same time that he has done nothing as yet to allow people to make an idea of him.

It is earnestly to be desired that he means all these statements seriously, and that the unique reason of Ismail Hakki Bey's present inaction lies with the Central Government, which seem to have adopted an obstructive policy in matters of internal administration.

In the province, nevertheless, cases of Kurdish lawlessness continue, one case serving to encourage and bring about another attempt of unusual daring. As I had the honour to report by my despatch of the 24th October last Belekly Kurds carried off by force the grains and provisions of Armenian villages of Taghavank and Lordentzor in Khuyt. Instead of adopting the trenchant method of settling the dispute in a case where the Armenians in question could prove the ownership of land by title-deeds the authorities here referred the matter to the civil court, where it is being dragged on for weeks past, and the destitute Armenian peasants of Khuyt are hopelessly pursuing the dispute, suffering enormous loss of money and time.

Two weeks ago one Yusuf Pasha, a Kurdish notable here and an ordinary brigand, encouraged probably by the example of the above-mentioned two villages, presented himself at the Armenian villages of Mezug and Perudk in Modky (caza of Bitlis sanjak), in the latter of which an Armenian was shot by Modky Kurds two days earlier, demanding the grains and winter provisions of peasants as produce of lands of which he claimed the ownership. The dispute was again referred to the civil court here, where the Kurd with forged title-deeds is sure to influence the course of procedure and defenceless peasants liable to lose their most legitimate property.

I have, &c.
A. S. SAFRASTIAN

[45662] No. 134.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 19.)

(No. 898.)
Sir, *Constantinople, December 14, 1910.*

WITH reference to Sir G. Lowther's despatch No. 509 of the 26th July last on the subject of Kurdish lawlessness at Khuyt, I have the honour to report that, in consequence of an attempt by the local Government to have recruits taken from these Kurds, some fighting has occurred in this district, the Kurds having resisted the Government officials and killed six soldiers out of the contingent sent to enforce the recruiting measures. A military expedition is now being prepared to punish the Kurds.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

[45665] No. 135.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 19.)

(No. 901.)
Sir, *Pera, December 14, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to report on the attempted seizure by the Ottoman authorities of an Italian dhow at Hodeidah, which has recently led to an incident between the two Governments.

The Italian version is to the following effect: Some two months ago a dhow from

Massowah, flying the Italian colours, sprang a leak and put in at Midi, north of Loheiah, for repairs. The captain obtained a certificate to that effect from the Arab Sheikh of Midi, who is also the Ottoman administrative authority. She had disembarked part of her cargo of petroleum when a Turkish revenue steam-boat arrived, declared that it was a case of contraband, and, seizing the dhow, took it to Hodeidah. There the Mutessarif and customs authorities, despite the protests of Signor Sola, the Italian consul-general, decided the matter to be a case of smuggling, and that the dhow should be seized. The Italian consul-general sent his dragoman and cavass on board the dhow to prevent seizure, and telegraphed to Massowah for a man-of-war, which appeared at Hodeidah with great promptitude, and took possession of the dhow. The matter created a considerable commotion locally, and the Arabs who had other grievances against the Mutessarif demanded his recall. He was accordingly dismissed. Thereupon the "Jeune Turc," a Constantinople Jewish paper, which has become notorious by its ultra-national articles, &c., against the Triple *Entente*, published a garbled version of the incident, described the whole case as an intolerable insult to Ottoman national honour, indulged in very discourteous remarks about the Italian Ambassador, and demanded the withdrawal of the Ottoman Ambassador at Rome and the boycott of Italian commerce until reparation was accorded for the insult to Turkish dignity. The Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs then instructed Baron Mayor des Planches to request the suppression of the "Jeune Turc," as martial law prevailed in Constantinople. This was done, but the paper appeared the next day under the name of "L'Orient," and commented vigorously on this tampering with the liberties of the press at the dictates of a foreign Government. "L'Orient," which has subsequently appeared as "Le Pays," is continuing a campaign on this line with the assistance of some deputies of advanced ideas. The Ottoman Government is reported to have begged the German Government to use its good offices with that of Italy, and to give the latter counsels of moderation, and it appears that Berlin has communicated with Rome on the subject.

According to the Turkish version, there would seem to be grounds for their assertion that the "Sambouk" was engaged in smuggling. The destination of the vessel, so Rifaat Pasha informed me, was not Midi, but Jizzan, and it was a very suspicious circumstance that at the time when she put into Midi in distress the consignees of the cargo should have been there to meet her. Further, a portion of the cargo discharged to enable the leak in the "Sambouk's" hull to be stopped was found by the revenue vessel loaded on camels, while a part had even been conveyed a short distance inland; again, the Sheikh of Midi was not recognised by the Porte as a "local authority," whose permit need be acknowledged by the customs vessel, and he was a notorious offender in many ways, against whom the Italian Government itself in November of 1902 had had to take forcible measures. Rifaat Pasha also strongly condemned the action of the Italian consul-general, who, he said, was a *mauvais coucheur*, not an Italian at all, but an Arab from Aleppo. It might be, his Excellency said, that the Turkish local authorities were sending false reports, and that the "Sambouk" was not smuggling, but the high-handed action of the Italian consul-general was unjustifiable in so petty a case, which would have been better settled by friendly examination.

He thought also that the Italian Government had made a mistake in demanding the suppression of the "Jeune Turc," as it was only giving a disreputable newspaper a fictitious importance. He thought the question would eventually be settled by friendly arbitration.

The incident, which bears a certain analogy to the seizure of hides from a British dhow referred to in your despatch No. 304 of the 11th October last, and previous correspondence on the same subject, is interesting, as constituting the first serious difference between a member of the Triple Alliance and the Young Turkey Government. The latter's susceptibilities have been further affected by the Marquis di San Giuliano's recent statement in the Italian Chamber concerning Italy's pretensions to an exclusive economic position in Tripoli of Barbary, *vis-à-vis* of other Powers. In fact, from the Turkish point of view, just as England and France are suspect owing to their intimate relations with Russia, so the friendly professions of the Austro-German combination are suspect owing to their alliance with Italy, if to a much less degree.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

[45898] No. 136.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 19.)

(No. 262.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, December 19, 1910.*

PIRATES' attack on Koweit dhow.

With reference to Foreign Office despatch No. 355 of the 6th instant, I have the honour to report as follows respecting the question of the surrender to us or to the Sheikh of Mohammerah of the men concerned:

His Majesty's acting consul at Mohammerah having sent a copy of Lord Crewe's telegram (enclosed in above-mentioned despatch) to Government of India to consulate at Bussorah, Mr. Crow at once referred matter to me. He is very doubtful as to whether anything will be gained by local representations unless the Bussorah authorities receive strict orders from here, especially as the Vali of Bussorah is reported already to have offered his resignation over the Mishri affair.

But before taking any action Mr. Crow begs for explicit instructions, particularly as to whether, in the event of his making the representations, he should do so in an official or in a private manner, as he thinks Sheikhs of Mohammerah and Koweit have probably before now approached the Turks direct.

Personally I feel convinced that Vali of Bussorah, whose attitude is not more satisfactory than that of his predecessor, will, like Suleiman Nazif, refuse to accept British intervention on the sheikh's behalf of any sort, even unofficial, and any representations from His Majesty's Embassy here will have the same fate, and I agree with Mr. Crow that it is most improbable that any request for the surrender of the criminals to Sheikh Khazal or to British officials on the sheikh's behalf will be accepted.

My fear is that a rebuff will be the only result of the steps proposed.

[45898] No. 137.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, December 21, 1910.*

WITH reference to your letter of the 14th instant, enclosing copy of a telegram to the Government of India on the subject of piracies in the Persian Gulf, I am directed by Secretary Sir Edward Grey to transmit to you herewith, for submission to the Earl of Crewe, copy of a telegram from His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople* relative to this question, pointing out that the steps suggested, whether taken at Constantinople or at Bussorah, are likely to lead only to a rebuff.

I am to enquire what view Lord Crewe takes as to the considerations set forth by Mr. Marling, and to state that Sir E. Grey would be glad to learn whether arrangements have actually been made for patrolling the Shatt-el-Arab by His Majesty's ships.

I am, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[46211] No. 138.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received December 22.)

(Confidential.)
Sir, *Admiralty, December 21, 1910.*

I HAVE laid before my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty your letter of the 14th instant respecting the unsatisfactory attitude toward British interests adopted by the Turkish local authorities at Bagdad and in the regions adjoining the Persian Gulf.

2. As regards the suggestion that His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" should visit the Island of Zakhmuniyeh, I am to acquaint you that His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" has temporarily left the Persian Gulf, and is now being refitted at Bombay.

The approaches to the island are unsurveyed and reported to be full of dangerous shoals; it is probable, however, that one of the ships employed in the arms traffic blockade could, if navigated with great care, approach the island within 2 or 3 miles.

* No. 136.

3. Their Lordships would be prepared to direct the Commander-in-chief, East Indies, to send a vessel to the island, provided that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs considers the matter to be of sufficient importance to justify the withdrawal of a vessel from the blockade and the navigational risks which would be incurred.

It is desirable in any case that the vessel should be absent from the blockade for as short a time as possible.

4. As, however, His Majesty's consul-general at Bushire has reported that the Turkish post on the island has been deserted it is not clear that anything would be gained by sending a ship there, and it is suggested as preferable that the Commander-in-chief, East Indies, who is now in the Persian Gulf, should be informed of the objects which the Secretary of State desires to attain, and that the action to be taken should be left to his discretion.

5. Their Lordships presume that the Commander-in-chief's proposal to visit Bagdad which was not approved (*vide* Foreign Office letter of the 13th instant) was made in order that he might have an opportunity of ascertaining the state of affairs personally.

6. I am to add that no report of visits of His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" to Wakra and Odeid have been received by the Admiralty.

I am, &c.
C. I. THOMAS.

[46243] No. 139.

Messrs. Lynch Brothers to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 22.)

3, Salters' Hall Court, Cannon Street, E.C., December 21, 1910.

Sir,

WE shall be obliged if you would kindly forward to His Majesty's chargé d'affaires in Constantinople the following note on the subject of the Governor-General of Bagdad, Nazim Pasha; at the same time we should be grateful if you would ask His Majesty's chargé d'affaires to treat this information as strictly confidential as regards its source:—

The proceedings of Nazim Pasha since his arrival in Bagdad, and especially latterly, would seem to indicate some mental derangement. Nazim Pasha is well known to Mr. H. F. B. Lynch, who passed much of his time in his society during the dramatic events in Constantinople in April-May 1909. At that time he was a sensible, grave old man, who inspired confidence and did not lose his head in spite of the exciting occurrences in which he was a leading actor. It is difficult to reconcile his present proceedings with the impression which he produced in the spring of 1909. Not only is he acting in a manner which for arbitrariness has not, so far as we are aware, been matched by any of his predecessors at Bagdad, but his conduct would seem to show a lack of mental balance. Writing on the 29th October, our Bagdad agent informed us that, since the arrival of Nazim Pasha, two presidents of the municipality have resigned their office. The last resignation is said to have been due to the refusal of the president to comply with an order given by a member of the Governor-General's staff to certify a building belonging to a British-Indian subject as in a dangerous condition, and also to the fact that the Governor-General attempted to force money out of the president for municipal works. The first president, who was appointed by Nazim Pasha himself, was removed from office because he refused to give his daughter in marriage to him. On the 16th November our agent reports further that the director of the Turkish Government steamers has received notice to give up his post, the reason being believed to be the refusal of this official to permit his daughter to marry the Governor-General's private secretary.

In view of the large British interests in Bagdad the present deplorable state of things there cannot fail to be of concern to His Majesty's Government.

We have, &c.
LYNCH BROTHERS.

[46229] No. 140.

Messrs. Lynch Brothers to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 22.)

3, Salters' Hall Court, Cannon Street, E.C., December 21, 1910.

Sir,

WE have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th instant on the subject of the demolition of our premises in Bagdad.

We are telegraphing to our agents in Bagdad enquiring upon what law the Turkish authorities are relying for the legality of their action in demolishing these premises; but our agents have already informed us that the constitution of the commission which has acted in this matter is apparently not in accordance with law. The facts, moreover, that a considerable part of our premises was taken and the walls demolished on the ground that it menaced public safety, which was demonstrably untrue, and that the sums hitherto offered for compensation are so small as to be frivolous, make it clear that we cannot hope for any justice to be meted out to us in Bagdad, where the new Governor-General, Nazim Pasha, has been acting in a wholly arbitrary and high-handed way. Our agents have received instructions to present a formal protest in writing to the local Turkish Government, but, in accordance with the interview which Mr. H. F. B. Lynch had at the Foreign Office on the 7th December, our agents will take no legal steps in Bagdad unless we hear from you that you desire us to do so. We have pointed out to you in previous despatches that any lawyer whom we might be able to persuade to take up the case, would, under present circumstances, be greatly influenced by fear of the Governor-General. We also urged upon you the point that to commence proceedings in Bagdad would probably have the effect of weakening the case of the embassy, and that this is a matter which must be settled with the central Government. However, we will, of course, defer to your wishes, should you consider that it would help our case, to initiate proceedings locally.

We should be obliged if you could kindly procure from the British Embassy in Constantinople a copy of the law of expropriation upon which the Turkish Government rely.

We have, &c.
LYNCH BROTHERS.

[44657] No. 141.

Sir Edward Grey to Mr. Marling.

(No. 368.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 24, 1910.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith copy of a letter from the Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company,* enquiring whether foreign capital is admissible in Turkish enterprises for the navigation of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers.

I propose, in reply to the company's enquiry, to give them the information contained in Mr. Crow's despatch No. 30, enclosed in Sir G. Lowther's despatch No. 401 of the 21st June, respecting the conditions on which a navigation permit was accorded to Aga Jaffer, but before doing so I should be glad to know whether, in your opinion, there is any objection to such an answer, or whether you have any observations to make on the subject of the company's letter.

I am, &c.
E. GREY.

[46537] No. 142.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 27.)

(No. 264.)

(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, December 27, 1910.*

HAURAN.

The railway line between Maan and Tabuk has been damaged apparently by several tribes acting jointly, and Fethi Pasha went yesterday to consult Sami Pasha at Deraa.

---

* No. 122.

[46553] No. 143.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 28.)

(No. 904.)
Sir, *Constantinople, December 15, 1910.*

WITH reference to Sir G. Lowther's despatch No. 746 of the 19th October, I have the honour to forward herewith two despatches from His Majesty's consul at Aleppo, reporting on the removal of the public prosecutor from Aleppo to Adana.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure 1 in No. 143.

Consul Fontana to Sir G. Lowther.

(No. 27.)
Sir, *Aleppo, November 15, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your Excellency's despatch of the 8th September last, transmitting copy of a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Salonica regarding the antecedents of Hussein Kinzim Bey, lately appointed Vali of Aleppo, together with a minute on the same subject by Mr. Fitzmaurice, first dragoman to His Majesty's Embassy.

As I had the honour to report by telegram, dated the 1st September, 1910, the ex-vali, General Fakhri Pasha, resigned, and was recalled in consequence of the arrest at his orders of Mustapha Assim Effendi, whom he sent to Constantinople on his own responsibility. Assim Effendi was for some time Kaimakam of Rakka, but was dismissed on Fakhri Pasha's recommendation for extorting bribes. After his dismissal Mustapha Assim Effendi came to Aleppo and started a newspaper called "Al Ahali." He published article after article criticising and inveighing against the Governor-General, until at length Fakhri Pasha sent for him, and offered to recommend him for the post of kaimakam of some minor kaza outside the vilayet of Aleppo. Assim Effendi declined the offer, declaring that he would accept no post but that of a mutessarif, unless it were a renomination as Kaimakam of Rakka. And on the vali's refusing to accede to his wishes he published a scurrilous article in the "Al Ahali," denouncing Fakhri Pasha as a tippler and gambler, who wasted his substance and neglected his duties. Incensed, and naturally incensed, at this calumny the Governor-General arrested and dispatched Mustapha Assim to Alexandretta, there to be embarked for Constantinople. Unfortunately, the Governor-General acted hastily and upon his own responsibility, and his action may not be considered as legal under the constitution. During his stay at Aleppo, Assim Effendi worked his way into the good graces of the local Committee of Union and Progress, the members of which are mostly subordinate military officers and tradesmen of small ability and reputation. And his expulsion gave rise to much indignation among these people, whose conceptions of liberty and fair play did not impel them to discourage a corrupt and unscrupulous journalist from libelling an honest and capable official, who conscientiously strove to do his duty in the face of much inertia and opposition. Yet Fakhri Pasha was, and continues to be, one of the foremost members of the central Committee of Union and Progress at Salonica. An invitation to attend a meeting of the local committee was declined by Fakhri Pasha, who learned that it was the intention of some subaltern to reprove him for his treatment of Mustapha Assim. And news of projected street demonstration and hooting against him reached his ears at about the time that a telegram from Constantinople notified to him his recall. Thereupon the vali hurriedly packed his personal belongings and took train for Budbek, leaving word that he needed a few days change of air, and might return shortly.

A telegram dispatched by Mustapha Assim Effendi from Constantinople, to the effect that he had been victorious, had obtained the dismissal of Fakhri Pasha, and was returning to Aleppo with the new Governor-General, was published in the local papers a day or two later. Fakhri Pasha, honest and distinguished in character and in services, ousted by a fraudulent and vindictive journalist, proceeded in disgrace to Constantinople, whilst his calumniator returned in triumph to Aleppo, where he still publishes articles vilifying his former chief.

The departure of General Fakhri Pasha was the outcome of the ever narrowing circle of necessity which has moved him to tender more than once his resignation, and

which finally restricted his movements, to use his own words, to the mere action of imprinting his seal.

In my despatch No. 25 of the 3rd ultimo, I had the honour to report the serious incident created by the cadi (appointed acting vali pending the arrival of Kinzim Bey), who rebuked and upbraided the public prosecutor for smoking in his office during Ramazan. The telegrams dispatched by the cadi and the public prosecutor to Constantinople resulted in the appointment of the commandant of the reserves as acting governor, and the departure, on leave of absence, of the public prosecutor. The defterdar, together with the mektoubji, who is a very able and liberal-minded official, sided with the public prosecutor in the dispute referred to, and they have since been transferred to Konieh.

It appears that the public prosecutor incurred the resentment of the cadi soon after his arrival at Aleppo nearly a year ago. He undertook the repair and enlargement of the law courts, and carried out the work very successfully. He secured, however, the largest and most comfortable room as his own private office, leaving the cadi a more modest apartment, and, not long after their completion, the law courts and offices were partly wrecked by fire, the cause of which has not yet transpired. Two law courts and a large number of the legal documents were destroyed; but, curiously enough, the office of the public prosecutor escaped injury, whereas the cadi, owing to the partial destruction of his apartment, was relegated to a still smaller room.

The cadi is a Turk of a short and burly form and dark and fanatical countenance, and his manner towards Christians is not marked by suavity. He appears to me totally unfitted by nature and education for any administrative post under the present Government.

The newly-appointed vali, Hussein Kiazim Bey, seems to be a man of considerable energy and vivacity. He speaks French fluently, having studied, he tells me, at the Ecole agronome at Paris. He brings with him excellent records of the administrative ability displayed by him whilst at Serres. Kiazim Bey is a wealthy man, and, unlike his predecessor, has no relatives or friends among the Moslem families of Aleppo. He informs me that, before accepting his present post, he demanded and was granted special powers beyond the authority with which Fakhri Pasha was vested. Without specifying the nature of these powers, he has given me to understand that he is authorised to exercise a certain control over the judicial authorities. He tells me that his duty is to use the axe, and to clear the way for his successor, and that as soon as the axe is no longer needed he will take his departure. He has refused to receive anonymous letters, and has posted up notices denouncing such letters and their writers as cowardly and contemptible. He has published a letter in Turkish and in Arabic in the local newspapers addressed to the Moslem notables and landed proprietors in the Aleppo neighbourhood, in which he rebukes them in no measured language for the injustice and oppression suffered at their hands by the villagers, who are their serfs, and by the poor, whom they think have no remedy against them. He tells them that their day is over, and, after quoting various passages from the Koran in support of his arguments and denunciations, warns them in the interest of the rights of the people that, if they persist in their evil courses, he will take them by the scruff of the neck and throw them out of the vilayet. Thus, Kiazim Bey has thrown down the gauntlet to the influential and wealthy Moslem magnates whom he speaks of, not without reason, as a set of rascally robbers. It remains to be seen whether the vali will succeed in holding his ground in face of the intrigues which will undoubtedly be woven against him.

Since drafting this despatch I have learned that the public prosecutor returned to Aleppo from leave of absence two days ago, and has resumed his duties at the law courts.

I have, &c.
RAPHAEL A. FONTANA.

Enclosure 2 in No. 143.

Consul Fontana to Mr. Marling.

(No. 29.)
Sir, *Aleppo, December 3, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatches No. 25 of the 3rd October last and No. 27 of the 15th ultimo, alluding to the serious incident to which the indiscretion of the cadi, then acting vali, gave rise through his denouncing and reviling the public prosecutor for smoking a cigarette in his office during Ramazan, to the consequent removal from

Aleppo of the defterdar and the mektoubji, who sided with the public prosecutor, and to the return of the latter to Aleppo from leave of absence shortly before the middle of last month, I now have the honour to report that the Minister of Justice has telegraphed to Saïd Zein-ed-din Effendi, the public prosecutor, notifying to him his transfer to Adana, a post of less importance than that of Aleppo.

A few days ago a deputation of certain of the leading local sheikhs waited upon the Governor-General at the Government House and peremptorily demanded the removal from Aleppo of the public prosecutor, who, they asserted, was a Druse and a freethinker, and consequently unworthy of the confidence of the Moslem population. At the same time, a demonstration was made in the courtyard of the Government House by a crowd of over 100 persons, who shouted for the recall of Saïd Zein-ed-din Effendi. The vali, perceiving in this the hand of the cadi, with whom he finds it necessary to be on excellent terms, promised to make enquiry and take action in the matter, and to that end he called a meeting of the presidents of the various tribunals and other leading judicial functionaries to deliberate upon the charges brought against the public prosecutor. The presidents appear to have been unanimous in supporting Saïd Zein-ed-din Effendi, who did so much in reconstructing and reorganising the law courts, and against whom even his enemies can bring no specific charge save that of his origin and his alleged indifference to matters of creed; and a dragoman of this consulate was afterwards informed by one of the presidents that he and all his colleagues would resign were the public prosecutor dismissed. On the 1st instant, however, the public prosecutor received a telegram from the Minister of Justice ordering him to at once join the assistant public prosecutor at Beirout and there await further orders, and shortly afterwards he received a second telegram informing him that he was transferred to Adana.

It appears that, subsequent to the incident during Ramazan set forth in my despatch No. 25, the public prosecutor wrote to Constantinople representing that the action of the cadi might have led to bloodshed at the konak, and even to the massacre of Turkish officials and of foreigners at Aleppo, had Arab fanaticism once been aroused; and he urged that the garrison at Aleppo—then weak in numbers—should speedily be reinforced. The cadi obtained, it seems, a copy of this letter, and used it as an instrument with which to excite the wrath of the Arab sheikhs and their followers against Zein-ed-din Effendi, whose representation, nevertheless, was, in my humble opinion, largely justifiable. The following are the names of the leading sheikhs who formed the deputation to the vali to demand the recall of Zein-ed-din Effendi, among them being that of a member of the influential Djabri Zadé family, another member of which, Nafi Pasha, is deputy for Aleppo:—

Roufahi Zadé Sheikh Riza.
Katoukhda Zadé Abdul Kader.
Yagan Zadé Amineen.
Bitar Zadé Fattah.
Koutsi Zadé Ghalal.
Djabri Zadé Fakher.
Nasor Aga Zadé Mohamed.
Koutsi Zadé Zia.
Aintably Zadé Assaad (Aurak Moudiry).

The chief local events during the last few months may be summarised as follows:—

General Fakhri Pasha, who was on friendly terms with most of the Eshraf (Moslem notables), was dismissed for arbitrarily arresting and deporting Mustapha Assim Effendi, the corrupt ex-kaïmakam and malicious journalist. The cadi, appointed acting vali pending the arrival of Kiazim Bey, seizes the opportunity presented by the smoking of a cigarette in Ramazan, and leads a successful "jehad" against the most efficient of the Young Turkish officials on the judicial and civil staff. Kiazim Bey, soon after taking up his appointment as Governor-General, menaces the Moslem notables and landowners in a letter, published in the local newspapers, that unless they abandon their oppressive and dishonest courses, he will take them by the neck and throw them out of the vilayet. He publicly threatens action against the influential Moslem families similar to that which his predecessor took—to his cost—against one insignificant and despicable journalist. The Eshraf remain silent, but an article, believed to emanate from the pen of Nafi Pasha, is published in the "Ikdam," deploring the rashness and inexperience of Kiazim Bey. Kiazim Bey, recognizing that

the cadi holds a strong position between the Government and the Eshraf, cultivates the best relations with him, and endeavours to establish a reputation as a pious Moslem. The local press indulges in innuendo, and expresses joy at the removal from Aleppo of the ex-vali, the public prosecutor, the defterdar, and the mektoubji, and the hope that other officials will soon follow in their wake. The Eshraf, in other ways divided, unite in privately decrying the vali and the Government generally, and no Turkish functionary can now fail to perceive that, at Aleppo, the Mosque is more powerful than the State and the cadi than the constitution. The removal of the cadi can alone relieve the discouragement of the better officials.

The situation as above portrayed may demonstrate how necessary it is that not one iota of the privileges enjoyed by foreigners under the Capitulations should be allowed to lapse. It is with pleasure that I have learned from my colleague the Italian consul, Signor Tosti, that he has received a despatch from the Marquis di San Giuliano, assuring him that it is the intention of the Italian Government strenuously to uphold every line of the Capitulations.

I have, &c.
RAPHAEL A. FONTANA.

[46554] No. 144.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(*Received December* 28.)

(No. 905.)
Sir, *Constantinople, December* 15, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's vice-consul at Adana, reporting the posting up of reactionary placards in that town containing threats both against the Government and against Christians.

I have, &c.
CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 144.

Vice-Consul Rawlins to Consul-General Eyres.

(No. 64.)
Sir, *Adana, December* 8, 1910.

I HAVE the honour to report that during the last few days anonymous posters, containing threats against the Young Turks and Christians, have been found in various parts of the town. These placards, which were presumably posted up in the night, were in the morning immediately pulled down and confiscated by the police, not before, however, that they had been read by many people and the fact become common knowledge.

Some of these posters were filled with a series of threats against the Young Turkish party, such as that "their days were numbered," while another poster, found on the walls near the great mosque, stated that "the Young Turks had poisoned the minds of the city folk, but that all true Ottomans should not allow themselves to be taken in by their wiles." Nobody as yet appears to know anything about the authors of these posters, but I hear that the local Government has taken the matter up very seriously.

It is said also that the vali has stirred a lot of bad feeling among the Moslems by urging them not to spend their money on buying sheep for sacrifice on the occasion of the coming Bairam, but rather to give all they can in the way of subscriptions to the Ottoman navy.

As to the real importance of these posters, I would not as yet venture to express any opinion. It is, however, a sign of the growing unrest among a portion of the Moslem population, and it is also strange that anybody should have been found so daring as to put up placards of such a nature in a town where the Governor-General is particularly strong and universally feared.

This event has not left a good impression in the town, and has had the effect of renewing the uneasiness among the Christian population. It is as yet too early, as I have mentioned above, to report upon this matter at any length, as the event is not at present worthy of the importance which might thereby be attributed to it.

I have, &c.
E. C. DONALDSON RAWLINS.

[46555] No. 145.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 28.)

(No. 906.)

Sir, *Constantinople, December 15, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour, with reference to my despatch No. 897 of the 9th instant, to inform you that His Majesty's vice-consul at Mosul reports as follows in regard to the military situation in his district:—

"There are 13 Nizam battalions, and if the strength of a battalion is estimated at a maximum of 450 men, the total amounts to 5,850.

"There are 32 Redif battalions, none of which are at present under arms. Desertion being exceptionally easy in this region, they are an almost insignificant element. The average strength of a battalion is probably not more than 30 men, in which case the 32 battalions constitute a force of 960 men.

"The head-quarters of the Nizam division (the 12th) and of one of the Redif divisions (the 24th) have been transferred from Mosul to Kerkuk, hitherto the head-quarters only of the 23rd Redif division, which remains there.

"Kerkuk, which has extensive barracks and is an important centre for recruiting amongst the Kurdish, Arab, and Turcoman sedentary population, has thus become the depôt of nearly all the troops in the district.

"Whilst some degree of concentration at that point could be explained by general considerations of internal and external policy and strategy the present massing of troops certainly exceeds any probable administrative requirements, and by absorbing the battalions previously stationed at Mosul, Sinjar, and Zakho leaves the north-western portion of the district undesirably depleted.

"A striking feature of the new position is the apparently permanent establishment of two Nizam battalions at Passova, and there is suggestion that the available military resources have been strained to secure a position more favourable for rapidly and effectively reinforcing, should circumstances allow, the advanced posts at Soujboulak, Nagirdeh, and perhaps other places beyond the eastern limit of the debatable frontier region, to say nothing of Bana and Serdesht, which lie within it.

"It appears, too, that barracks have been constructed at Passova, and telegraphic communication has been extended to that post from Ravanduz through Rayat."

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING.

[46557] No. 146.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 28.)

(No. 908.)

Sir, *Constantinople, December 18, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's consul at Erzeroum reporting on the refusal of the Armenian Bishop of Erzeroum to comply with the new regulations requiring the Armenian schools to submit to inspection by the Government Director of Public Instruction.

This is one of the first cases of protest against the Committee of Union and Progress's policy of Ottomanising the country which have come to the notice of this embassy, but it is to be anticipated that more will follow; and if, as it is rumoured, Hussein Djahid should ever become Minister of Public Instruction, it is certain that more will be heard of this Ottomanising policy directed against non-Moslem schools—a policy which the committee may seek eventually to extend to foreign schools.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 146.

Consul McGregor to Mr. Marling.

(No. 96.)

Sir, *Erzeroum, December 6, 1910.*

I HAVE the honour to report that during a recent conversation Mgr. Sempad, the Armenian Bishop of Erzeroum, informed me that he had been much perturbed at receiving

a communication from the Governor-General to the effect that henceforward the Armenian schools would be required to submit to inspection by the Government Director of Public Instruction.

This, the bishop declared, was an infringement of the guaranteed privileges of the Armenian Patriarchate, and a first step towards the realisation of the chauvinistic policy of the new régime in educational matters. It was intolerable that the Armenian national schools should thus be placed at the mercy of a department whose incapacity was notorious, and whose tendencies would have disastrous results for the moral and intellectual development of all the Christian communities. He had therefore informed the vali in an official note that he could not comply with this innovation, and he had no doubt that his action would be approved by the Patriarchate.

His Eminence went on to say that he had lost all hope of the so-called constitutional régime bringing about any real improvement in the condition of the Armenians. The enquiry into the agrarian problem had been a shameless farce, and now the Government were aiming a deadly blow at the schools, which, with the Church, formed the most precious heritage of the Armenian people. He also spoke with bitterness of the evil effects of the doctrines inculcated by the Tashnaksution, but added that the influence of that society was on the wane; its alliance with the Committee of Union and Progress had from the first been regarded with misgiving by the mass of the Armenians, and now that the anti-Christian bias of the committee was becoming more apparent, a continuance of this unnatural partnership could only be viewed as a betrayal.

I should mention that the bishop has always been, and still is, on excellent personal terms with the authorities, and that he has just returned from a visit to Echmiadzin, whither he had proceeded in order to be consecrated as bishop of this diocese.

I have, &c.

P. J. C. McGREGOR.

[46565] No. 147.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 28.)

(No. 916.)

Sir, *Constantinople, December 21, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 815 of the 8th ultimo, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, reporting on two cases of demolition by the local authorities of the properties of British subjects. As soon as I receive a complete list of these cases, I shall not fail to put in a claim at the Sublime Porte for the losses which have thus been caused to British subjects.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure 1 in No. 147.

Consul-General Lorimer to Sir G. Louther.

(No. 62. Confidential.)

Your Excellency, *Bagdad, November 17, 1910.*

IN continuation of the correspondence ending with my despatch No. 53 of the 7th October, 1910, I have the honour to report that the front of Mr. G. Thaddeus's shop* and part of the front of the late Nawab Ahmad 'Ali Khan's house† have now been destroyed as dangerous—though they were not dangerous—in addition to the wall‡ and shops belonging to Messrs. Stephen Lynch and Co., and part of the Ikbal-ul-Daulah house,§ the demolition of which had already been reported by me.

I have had the honour of informing your Excellency by telegram, from time to time, of the progress of these events, and of soliciting your Excellency's assistance, but it was impossible for me to report by wire the entire circumstances of the two latest demolitions. Some particulars of them will be found in Enclosure 2 to this

* Item No. 5 in my despatch No. 42 of the 5th September, 1910.
† Item No. 6 in the same.
‡ Item No. 1 in the same.
§ Item No. 4 in the same.

despatch, illustrating the perverse spirit in which the vilayet have acted with regard to them.

Enclosures 3 and 5 to the present despatch are memoranda by Mr. J. C. Gaskin, the commercial assistant in this residency, who is an expert in building questions at Bagdad, containing estimates of the compensation to which Mr. G. Thaddeus and Sufiyah Khanum, the widow of the late Nawab Ahmad 'Ali Khan, appear to justly entitled.

Mr. Gaskin finds that the cost of restoring the front part of Mr. Thaddeus's shop will be £ T. 29 2 g.s.p. and that the value of the ground belonging to it, appropriated for the public street, is £ T. 177 74 g.s.p.; total, £ T. 206 76 g.s.p. In the case of the late Nawab Ahmad 'Ali Khan's house, the cost of rebuilding is estimated by Mr. Gaskin at £ T. 786 105½ g.s.p., and the value of the area taken for the street at £ T. 100 70 g.s.p; total, £ T. 887 67½ g.s.p. Both buildings are situated on the present main artery of longitudinal communication in Bagdad, where frontage is naturally very valuable.

Since my despatch No. 42 of the 5th September, 1910, was written, I have had frequent occasion to refer to the text of the Turkish Expropriation and Building Laws, and I am now inclined to think that articles 8 and 13 of the latter do not bar a claim for compensation on account of ground taken, unless the ground is unbuilt upon. In both the present cases the ground taken was altogether built over, and in that of Mr. Thaddeus's shop it amounted to more than one-fourth of the whole property; but this latter fact, in my altered view, has no bearing on the question of compensation. The principal loss to Mr. Thaddeus is that of a very valuable plot of land, and I am of opinion that ground compensation should be demanded on behalf of both proprietors. The chicanery by which the vilayet have sought to substitute demolition proceedings for legal expropriation is an additional strong reason for not waiving any part of the compensation which is properly exigible.

In a telegram to your Excellency, dated the 12th November, 1910, which I repeated to the Government of India, as Indian subjects of His Britannic Majesty were principally affected, I remarked on the alarm to British subjects and the injury to British prestige which the successful execution by the local Government of their unscrupulous designs, notwithstanding my persistent protests, had occasioned. Until the rights of our subjects and the credit of our Government have been vindicated by visible means, such as the recovery of compensation, our national position at Bagdad will continue to be very unsatisfactory, and may be exposed to fresh attacks, and I therefore respectfully beg that your Excellency will take the observations contained in my telegram into very careful consideration.

I have, &c.
J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 2 in No. 147.

Memorandum of Circumstances connected with the Partial Demolition of Mr. G. Thaddeus's Shop and the House of the late Nawab Ahmad 'Ali Khan.

Mr. G. Thaddeus's Shop.

ON the 26th October Eram Bey, the vali's political secretary, called and informed me that his Excellency had decided to refer the state of the shop to a French architect (not engineer), M. Godard,* who has lately been taken into the Turkish service. This gentleman, he assured me, might be relied on to deliver a candid and unbiassed opinion, independent of one already given by Colonel Javad Bey, the vali's engineer. By my advice, Mr. M. Thaddeus, a son of the proprietor of the shop, at once called on Eram Bey to ask that he might be sent for, as his father's representative, when the shop was inspected by M. Godard; but Eram Bey told him, considerably to his surprise, that the inspection had already taken place. On Mr. Thaddeus's enquiring the result, however, he was told that it was "rather favourable" to his father.

Notwithstanding this semi-assurance, it became apparent, on the 3rd November, that the front of the shop was about to be demolished after all. I accordingly wrote to Eram Bey for an explanation, and the next morning he came and informed me

* See Monthly Summary of Events, September 1910.

verbally that M. Godard had placed him in a very difficult position by a change of opinion. Meanwhile, Mr. Thaddeus (junior), by my advice, had personally visited M. Godard and discussed matters with him. M. Godard seems to have evaded a direct question by Mr. Thaddeus as to whether he considered the shop dangerous, and to have limited himself to saying that it was "not strong." At the same time, he admitted, according to Mr. Thaddeus, that nearly every building in Bagdad would fall within his "not strong" category.

On the 7th November the shop was partially dismantled by municipal agency. It had been my contention all along that the shop was a timber-frame structure, and that its strength did not depend on the brick-filling between the beams, which filling, though nearly perpendicular, was not absolutely so. The correctness of my assertion was now demonstrated by the fact that, after all the bricks in the front had been removed, the frame stood as firmly as before, supporting the roof, in which condition it was allowed by the municipality to remain for some days. I ascertained these facts by a personal inspection on the 8th November.

On the 10th November Eram Bey told me that M. Godard had discovered that the foundations ("fondement") of the shop were of wood, and that the wood was rotten. I took an opportunity of visiting the shop the same day, the front minus the bricks being then still standing, and found that, as I thought, the statement was untrue. The foundations were of brick, and contained no wood, and the wood-work which rested on the foundations was perfectly sound.

House of the late Nawab Ahmad 'Ali Khan.

On the evening of the 7th November, the day of the dismantling of Mr. Thaddeus's shop, the family of the late Nawab Ahmad 'Ali Khan were informed that a portion of their house in question, which had been pronounced dangerous—though not really so—would be demolished.

The next morning (the 8th) Eram Bey visited me, and requested me verbally to send a dragoman to see to the removal of furniture, &c., from the rooms affected. After visiting the house, to satisfy myself of its condition, I replied, in writing, that I could not take any steps to facilitate the proceedings, which I regarded as totally unjustifiable. I also observed that only part of the house was old or open to criticism, and that that part was repairable. Eram Bey replied, taking general exception to my attitude, but mentioning for the first time that only the old part was to be demolished.

On the 9th November I received an official letter from the vilayet, repeating the request already made through Eram Bey, and fixing the demolition for the next day at 8 o'clock (Turkish). I answered that if an assurance were given that, should the land cleared by the demolition be taken for the street, the municipality would pay the cost of reconstructing the front and interior of the house upon the new alignment, I should be happy to comply with his Excellency's wishes, but that otherwise I must abstain from an act which might be construed as indicating acquiescence, and the municipality must proceed in the matter on their own responsibility and at their own risk.

On the 11th and 12th November the old part and some of the new part of the house were demolished by municipal labourers. The ostentatious violence with which this was done has been remarked on, in conversation with me, by various persons; but the details are mostly unimportant. Old carved windows, &c., were hurled in the street instead of being carefully removed, and even the broken fragments which remained disappeared during the night.

I have, &c.
J. G. LORIMER.

Enclosure 3 in No. 147.

Memorandum by Mr. Gaskin.

AN estimate of cost of restoring the frontage of Mr. G. Thaddeus's shop and of the value of the ground appropriated by the municipality for widening the road is attached.

The average breadth of the ground taken by the municipality is 7 ft. 5 in. (2·26 metres), and the length is 33 feet (10·05 metres), thus the area is 22·71 square metres.

The price of the ground has been valued at 540 g.s.p. per square dhra' ma'mari, or 845 g.s.p. the square metre.

The original area of the shop was about 79 square metres, and now it is reduced to 56·29 square metres, less than three-quarters of the plot, and consequently the purposes for which it can now be used are limited, and naturally the price is adversely affected.

J. C. GASKIN,
Commercial Assistant.

Bagdad, September 16, 1910.

Enclosure 4 in No. 147.

ESTIMATE of Cost of Restoring the Frontage of Mr. G. Thaddeus's Shop in the Mahkana Road, leased to Messrs. Abdul 'Ali Brothers, and Value of Land appropriated.

—	Cubic Metres.	Rate in G.s.p.	Amount in G.s.p.
Excavating foundations, 10 by 75 metres	7·50	2	15·00
Clearing débris	..	..	10·00
Foundation built of bricks with mud and lime mortar	7·50	75	562·50
Wall of plinth built of bricks and gypsum mortar, 10 by 60 metres	6·00	110	660·00
Eight wooden posts, 6 inches diameter	..	40	320·00
Two beams for bridges	..	60	120·00
Five poles for cross-bracing posts	..	30	150·00
Brick and gypsum mortar filling between posts, excluding door and two windows	5·10 (square metres)	110	561·00
Plastering inner surface of wall	34·00	3¾	127·50
Cost of large door and two iron-barred windows with fittings ..	..	..	500·00
Supervision	..	..	108·00
			3,134·00
Land appropriated by the municipality, 10·05 by 2·26 metres ..	22·71	845	19,189·95
Total of estimated loss to Mr. Thaddeus	..	..	22,323·95

22,324 g.s.p÷108=£ T. 206 76 g.s.p.

J. C. GASKIN, *Commercial Assistant.*

Bagdad, November 16, 1910.

Enclosure 5 in No. 147.

Memorandum by Mr. Gaskin.

ROUGH plans of the house of the late Nawab Ahmed 'Ali Khan, and estimates of cost of restoring the front and interior in the same style as before its demolition by the municipality, and the value of the land appropriated by the latter are attached.

Owing to a rise in the prices of building materials the rates per cubic metre have been readjusted accordingly.

Before the house was demolished I held the opinion that it was not dangerous and that it would hold out a few more years, and with some repairs could be made solid. I saw the alleged dangerous part of the house while it was being pulled down, and consequently saw the internal condition of the walls, and I found no reason to modify my previous views.

Further, the entrance hall and rooms above it were found to be solidly built and strong, and there was not the slightest justification for the destruction of that part of the house. It is very evident that the alleged dangerous condition of the house was put forward merely as a pretext for pulling it down, with the object of justifying the acquirement of a portion of the ground for the purpose of adding to the width of the road without having to pay for it.

In pulling down the front wall no care was taken to save the woodwork of the two shahnishins, the ceilings, and the side of the large upper room; and it has been unnecessarily and ruthlessly destroyed.

A large portion of the beams and posts have been removed by the orders of the municipality to be sold for the purpose of defraying the expense of demolition.

The amount shown in the estimate is not the true loss. The courtyard of the house is only 7·87 metres long by 7·21 metres broad, and if the front part of the house is taken 2½ metres backwards the courtyard will be 7·87 metres long and 4·71 metres broad—a narrow alley—detracting much from the value of the site of the house

generally. The sum that may be paid eventually for the appropriated ground will not recompense the owners for the shrinkage in the value.

J. C. GASKIN, *Commercial Assistant.*

Bagdad, September 16, 1910.

Enclosure 6 in No. 147.

ROUGH Plans of the Ground and First Floors of the late Nawab Ahmad 'Ali Khan's House, partly demolished by the Bagdad Municipality.

[Maps not reproduced.]

Enclosure 7 in No. 147.

ESTIMATED Cost of Restoring the Front and Interior of the late Nawab Ahmad 'Ali Khan's House in the same style as before it was demolished by the Municipality, and the Value of the Land appropriated by the latter.

—	Cubic Metres.	Rate in G.s.p	Amount in G.s.p.
Excavating foundation	120·60	2	241·20
Clearing débris	..	..	250·00
Foundation built of broken bricks and lime and mud mortar ..	80·40	75	6,030·00
Section of ditto, built of bricks and ashes and lime mortar ..	40·20	80	3,216·00
Section of walls built of bricks and ashes and lime mortar ..	30·78	80	2,462·40
Section of walls built of bricks and gypsum and mud mortar to first floor	34·53	80	2,762·40
Walls and dome of entrance hall built of bricks and gypsum mortar	48·77	110	5,364·70
Walls of stairs to first floor built of bricks and gypsum mortar ..	14·25	110	1,567·50
Stairs to first floor built of bricks and gypsum mortar	4·50	110	495·00
Walls of first floor built of bricks and gypsum and mud mortar ..	73·26	80	5,860·80
Walls of stairs from first floor to roof built of bricks and gypsum mortar	25·00	110	2,750·00
Stairs from first floor to roof built of bricks and gypsum mortar ..	7·20	110	792·00
Stairs from first floor to kafishkan built of bricks and gypsum mortar	3·60	110	396·00
Parapet of roof built of bricks and gypsum mortar	10·77	110	1,184·70
Wood-belt above section of wall of bricks and ashes and lime mortar	42·00	5	210·00
Roofing of ground and first floors	94·50	60	5,670·00
Verandah of first floor near stairs	5·40	60	324·00
Facing bricks	269·00	2½	672·50
Pointing walls of ground floor	168·00	3	504·00
Plastering walls of rooms and stairs	178·00	3¾	667·50
Black flooring to hall, iwan, rooms, and roof	144·37	8	1,155·00
Side of large room made of small pieces of Indian wood fitted in intricate geometrical design, including windows shutters, and doors	32·46	540	17,528·40
Ceiling of large room in fine wooden panel and fretwork, painted and gilt	34·62	108	3,739·00
Cornice of large room, painted with portraits, animal and flower pictures, in oil colours, and embellished with gold leaf	6·88	200	1,376·00
Shahnishin of large room in fine wooden panelling	22·48	320	7,193·60
Ceiling of iwan in wooden panelling	16·00	25	400·00
Ceilings of small room and kafishkan in deal match-boards ..	39·57	10	395·70
Shahnishan of kafishkan in fine wood panelling	12·46	320	3,987·20
Ten wooden beams supporting above two shahnishins	..	250	2,500·00
Two heavy wooden pillars, with bridge beam and boxing, supporting roof of iwan	..	..	900·00
Fine wood panelled eaves, with fancy edging round two shahnishins and two sides of roof	22·89 (lineal metres)	35	801·15
Wood and iron railing two sides of roof	14·63	25	365·75
Wooden railing along above verandah	3·30	30	99·00
Cost of four doors and two windows	..	..	972·00
Supervision	..	..	2,160·00
Total of estimated cost of restoration	..	..	84,993·50
Land appropriated by the Bagdad municipality, 13·42 by 2½ metres	33·55	324	10,870·00
Total of estimated loss to the heirs of the late Nawab Ahmad 'Ali Khan	..	..	95,863·50

95,863½ g.s.p.÷108=£ T. 887 67½ g.s.p.

J. C. GASKIN, *Commercial Assistant.*

Bagdad, November 15, 1910.

[46567] No. 148.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 28.)

(No. 918. Confidential.)

Sir, *Pera, December 20, 1910.*

IN the course of an interview which I had with him this morning Rifaat Pasha turned the conversation to Anglo-Turkish relations. He observed with great regret that the warm sympathy which had been evoked in Great Britain by the re-establishment of the constitution had given place almost to disapproval, that the tone of the English press towards Turkey was something more than cold, and that generally we appeared to *louder*. He added also that we appeared in particular to be unfriendly to the committee. I told his Excellency that the feelings of England were as friendly as ever they had been, but I must admit freely that the course of events in Turkey had caused considerable disappointment in England, and that public opinion was wondering where the necessity was in a constitutional country for the maintenance of martial law in the capital, for military operations in Albania and the Hauran, for the cruelties perpetrated during the disarmament of Macedonia, for the arrest of deputies on flimsy charges of conspiracy, &c., these were things which seemed quite incompatible with a constitutional régime as understood in Great Britain. Englishmen could not possibly approve of such proceedings; their attitude was one of silent regret at seeing Turkey, as they believed, pursuing a mistaken policy; as for the English press, I thought that it had been singularly kind to Turkey, for it had been extremely reticent of late and had published but a small portion of the facts injurious to the present Government which had been reported here and substantiated by the Opposition deputies in the Chamber.

His Excellency said that the statements made by the Opposition were grossly exaggerated and often untrue, and went on to defend the forcible measures taken against the Albanians and in the Hauran, while he complained that it was not fair to judge Turkey by English standards.

I said that such measures seemed to English minds inconsistent with the principles proclaimed at the restoration of the constitution, and went on to remark that Great Britain was also disappointed that there had been no recognition of the very great services we had rendered to Turkey in the early days of the new régime, *e.g.*, over the questions of the independence of Bulgaria and the Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, when without our support Turkey would never have obtained a single penny of the two large indemnities. All that seemed to have been forgotten now; and when concessions were to be granted, there seemed to be marked preference for foreigners as against English. This feeling of soreness, I would tell him frankly, was to a certain extent shared by His Majesty's Government, and I myself noticed with regret that my representations in cases such, for instance, as the arbitrary demolition of the properties of British subjects in Bagdad, of which I had just been speaking to his Excellency, were not received with the friendly spirit we expect to find in the Ottoman Government. If there had been any change of sentiment, it was not on our side, but on that of the Turks themselves; take for example the Lynch case, the first affair of the nature of a concession in which His Majesty's Government had shown any particular interest. The Grand Vizier and three Ministers had solemnly promised that the fusion of the two companies would be brought about, but those promises had never been fulfilled. Hakki Pasha had mentioned the question in his speech before the Chamber as though it were not yet definitely closed. Could his Excellency tell me that there was any prospect of a satisfactory arrangement being arrived at? Rifaat Pasha was evidently unprepared to answer this question and reverted to what he had said about our attitude to the committee. I replied that we had to judge the committee by results. The committee press was full of unfriendly articles, and the Government which was a committee Government seemed to be inspired by motives little in sympathy with England.

Rifaat Pasha replied with some warmth that the Government did not depend on the committee, to which I retorted that the Government was kept in office by the Union and Progress party, which was avowedly directed by the Salonica committee, and presumably in a constitutional country the Ministry in office represented the views of its supporters. In any case, with martial law in force in the capital, it was impossible to pretend that the committee could not if it pleased alter the tone of the press. Rifaat Pasha said that if only a single sympathetic article appeared in the "Times" or

some other leading paper, we should see a complete change in the attitude of the Turkish press. I said that I should be better pleased to see a change in the attitude of the Government, and of the local authorities all over the Empire; to which his Excellency said he supposed I was still thinking of Bagdad, but I must not attach too great importance to the proceedings of Nazim Pasha. "Why," his Excellency exclaimed, "you seem to think that Nazim Pasha was instructed to show an anti-English bias." That was, of course, nonsense; the fact was that Nazim was quite out of control, and appeared to think himself outside all law; he was constantly being called to order by the Minister of the Interior, but without the smallest effect. I said that I was not thinking of Bagdad alone, but of such incidents also as the boycott of British shops at Smyrna; but it was chiefly the Turkish attitude towards British interests in the Bagdad and Bussorah vilayets that I had in my mind. It seemed to me that the ridiculous ideas that Great Britain had designs on Mesopotamia, which were so recklessly disseminated at the time of the Lynch affair, were still being propagated, and that the Imperial authorities in those parts were affected by them, and I gave as an instance the action of the Vali of Bussorah, who had refused only two days before, except on special instructions from Constantinople, to pay the customary courtesies in the way of salutes to Admiral Slade, who was about to visit that port. His Excellency had been good enough to send the instructions, and I hoped the visit had passed off without incident; but it ought to have been quite unnecessary for me to ask that orders should be sent. From this his Excellency could see for himself that I had grounds for complaint.

Rifaat Pasha then said that there was a general feeling that Great Britain was not well disposed towards Turkey on account of her refusal to agree to the increase of the customs duties, as she wished to use that as a lever to prevent the building of the Bagdad Railway. We had been preaching that Turkey ought to set her finances in order, but we ourselves were standing in the way of it by preventing her from increasing her revenue.

I said that there were two ways of looking at this question. Last January there had been pourparlers between Dr. Gwinner and Sir E. Cassel for a solution of the Bagdad Railway question, and the former had suggested conditions which he knew perfectly well we could not possibly accept. It was pretty clear that this had been done simply with the object of throwing on us the odium of refusing the 4 per cent., whereas it was really the Germans who would not make it possible for us to do otherwise. And of course we had to protect our own interests.

His Excellency then began to discuss the possibility of some arrangement which would satisfy the requirements of His Majesty's Government in respect of the Bagdad Railway, the substance of which I have recorded in another despatch.

I have no doubt that Rifaat Pasha himself, and probably also the Grand Vizier and some other Ministers, are quite sincere in wishing to see more cordial relations re-established between the two countries, but the policy of the Committee of Union and Progress, which is really the guiding force of the Government, leans to the Triple Alliance rather than towards Great Britain, France, and Russia, while their programme foreshadows eventually a Pan-Islamic policy of aggression towards the three latter Powers. It is therefore to be concluded that the present overtures have been made simply to secure a more complaisant attitude on our part in financial matters, and in the circumstances we should not respond too readily to Rifaat Pasha's overtures, but await some substantial proof of a change of policy on the part of Turkey.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING.

[46581] No. 149.

Mr. Marling to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 28.)

(No. 66. Consular.)

Sir, *Constantinople, December 21, 1910.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 49, Consular, of the 21st September last, I have the honour to forward herewith a despatch from His Majesty's consul-general at Bagdad, submitting copy of a further letter which he has addressed to the Government of India on the subject of the proposal to transfer the Bagdad post to the Levant consular service.

I have, &c.

CHARLES M. MARLING.

Enclosure in No. 149.

Consul-General Lorimer to Government of India.

(Secret.)

Sir, *Bagdad, November* 17, 1910.

IN my letter of the 20th August, 1910, to the Government of India in the Foreign Department, I had the honour to enclose a memorandum relating to the suggested transfer of the representation of British interests at Bagdad from the Indian political to the Levant consular service, and a general reduction of the expenditure on that post. The reasons against a change advanced in the memorandum were mostly of a permanent character, and I desire now to supplement them by others of a nature probably more transient.

2. In view of the unsatisfactory state of affairs which prevails in this province of Turkey and in the neighbouring country of Persia, the present time is, in my opinion, inopportune for any visible reduction of the British establishments at Bagdad. Any diminution of British prestige or influence would, I anticipate, react unfavourably on British interests at what is probably a critical and formative epoch in the history of both Turkey and Persia.

Certain minor reductions in the establishments of the Bagdad political residency, proposed by me and sanctioned by the Government of India in their letter of the 28th September, 1910, will shortly come into effect; but they are not such as to attract attention or to produce political consequences.

3. The Government of India will have observed from my recent monthly summaries of events in Turkish Irak that Nazim Pasha's administration of the province has already belied the fair promises with which it started, and that its future is beset by difficulties, if not by dangers.

Evidences of any constructive policy are entirely wanting. Irrigation and agriculture are neglected; not a single ordinary road has yet been begun, though one of the chief disadvantages under which the country labours is a total want of the most ordinary communications. Many schemes of improvement have been discussed (*vide* my summaries *passim*), but none of them seem likely to take material shape. Attention has been chiefly devoted to the army and to the Bagdad municipality, but without much beneficial result to either; and effort in military reform seems likely to be arrested shortly for want of funds. In spite of a sweeping reduction of outlying garrisons, the military force which it has been possible to concentrate at Bagdad only amounts to about 2,000 infantry with a few cavalry and artillery; and the military position, unless the emergency measure of calling out the reserves—recently disbanded—is taken, will continue to be extremely weak. The widening of certain streets at Bagdad, though carried out with much illegality and oppression, is being done in such a manner as to confer very little advantage on the town.

On the other hand, tribal questions have been allowed to slide, and the chief difficulty of administration in this province has thus, for the present, been avoided. But sooner or later the prestige of the Government will have to be rehabilitated in districts which they now find it convenient to ignore, raids and robberies will have to be punished, and tribes which are withholding their taxes will have to be coerced; and it is then that the embarrassments of the new administration are likely to begin, and that their powerlessness may be expected to become apparent.

It would perhaps be going too far to aver that where Nazim Pasha seems to have failed—though he came here with the amplest powers and a staff of his own choosing, including, probably, some officers of the best type that Turkey can supply—no other can succeed; but those following him will be confronted by the same difficulties as he. Those difficulties appear to me to be inherent in the situation, and almost certain to prove insuperable within any period to which it is possible to look forward. The chief are administrative ignorance and incapacity in even the best Turkish officials, aggravated by peremptoriness and a lack of sympathy with the governed; the entirely non-Turkish character of this province; and the great extent, sparse population, and poverty of the country as a whole.

It may be added that the policy of the new Government here towards foreign interests and subjects has been one of unprecedented hostility; indeed, their action in a number of matters affecting foreigners has been but little, if at all, removed from persecution. As the Government of India are aware, the aggressions of the local Government have extended even to British subjects, some of whom have suffered severely and have not so far obtained redress.

The facts above recounted do not appear to me to favour any radical reduction

in the British establishments at Bagdad. Such a measure could not manifestly be ascribed to any increase of confidence on the part of His Britannic Majesty's Government in the Turkish administration of Irak; and, on the other hand, it might, and probably would, be regarded as a sign that British interests here no longer stand on the same dignified and unassailable basis as formerly.

4. The connection between Persia and the Turkish province of Irak is very intimate. Irak contains the two principal shrines of Persian pilgrimage, and the mujteheds of Nejef and Kerbela appear to be held in high, though undeserved, estimation by the ignorant masses in Persia. Persian subjects in this country are computed at 50,000 souls. The trade of Bagdad itself is, to the extent of one-half at least, a transit trade between Persia and the rest of the world. In these circumstances, whatever happens in Irak becomes quickly known in Persia, and, if it has any bearing on Persian affairs, influences feeling and opinion in that country.

It follows that the question of a diminution in the status of the British residency at Bagdad requires to be carefully considered with reference to British policy in Persia also; but whether such a diminution would or would not produce an impression in Persia that British influence in the Middle East was declining, and what the results of such an impression might in present circumstances be, are points upon which I am not qualified to advise.

5. I venture to submit, however, that the functions of the resident at Bagdad are still as necessarily and essentially political as they have been at any time since Bagdad ceased to be a pashalik independent, except in name, of the Porte; and I infer, with respect, that the time has not yet come for suppressing the political attributes of the post and reducing it to a commercial consulate. In my humble opinion, it would be prudent to postpone any such fundamental and irrevocable change until the internal situation in Turkey, and possibly in Persia also, is more promising and more settled than it appears at present.

6. In conclusion, I may advert, though the matter is still in an inchoate stage, to Sir William Willcocks's scheme for the construction of a railway between Bagdad and Bussorah, which was brought to notice in my (very confidential) despatch* of the 17th October, 1910, to His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople. It seems most probable that this enterprise, if undertaken under British financial auspices, would be directed from India, where railway construction and working are subject to much the same conditions as they would be here; and the effect of the line, when completed, would no doubt be to increase the eastward trend of Mesopotamian interests and affairs.

I have, &c.

J. G. LORIMER, I.C.S.,

Political Resident in Turkish Arabia.

[44656] No. 150.

Foreign Office to Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company.

Sir, *Foreign Office, December* 28, 1910.

I AM directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant on the subject of your claim for a refund of duty on your steamer the "Julnar."

Sir E. Grey is aware that the precedent of 1877 does not stand by itself, and that the precedents which are material since that date are those of the "Khalifah" and the "Mejidieh" in 1880 and 1883 respectively. These vessels were, like the "Blosse Lynch," imported into Turkey in pieces for subsequent navigation on the Tigris.

There is no correspondence in this Office as to customs duties having been paid on the two latter vessels, and Sir E. Grey therefore assumes that they were exempted on the grounds applicable to the case of the "Blosse Lynch," viz., that a ship imported in pieces is not merchandise, but is equivalent to a ship, and therefore not liable to duty.

But even if the Porte did not refuse on the grounds of which you were inform in the letter from this Office of the 25th ultimo, to follow the course adopted by the late Government, the precedents quoted would still be impaired by the fact that in the cases of the "Shushan" and the "Malamir," which in 1890 and 1893 were imported in parts into Turkey, fitted together at Maaghil, and re-exported for use wholly or mainly in Persian waters, your company acquiesced in the payment of

* Copies were sent to the Government of India under endorsement of the same date.

1 per cent. transit duty, thereby abandoning the claim that a ship in parts remains always a ship, and admitting that the parts of a ship are merchandise.

This admission was also made by your company in the present case of the "Julnar." The ship was first destined for use on the Karun, and the company gave notice that they would claim the refund of 10 per cent. out of the 11 per cent. duty exacted.

In these circumstances Sir E. Grey is of opinion that no useful purpose would be served by pressing the Turkish Government further on the subject.

I have, &c.
LOUIS MALLET.

[47123] No. 151.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(*Received December* 31.)

Sir, *India Office, December* 30, 1910.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for India to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 21st and 24th December, regarding piracies in the Persian Gulf and the suggested visit of one of His Majesty's ships to Zakhnuniyeh Island.

In reply, I am to enclose, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, copy of telegrams exchanged with the Government of India (together with papers received by mail relating to the Mishri case),* and to say that the Earl of Crewe feels a certain difficulty in offering advice on these subjects. The possible presence of a few Turkish soldiers on Zakhnuniyeh Island is not in itself of such consequence as to justify the running of any risk, and certainly not the risk of the loss of prestige that would ensue if, for example, one of His Majesty's ships ran aground in the enterprise. Similarly, the piracy, though it is of greater importance (since, as Colonel Cox points out, it took place on the high seas), is not in itself so important as to justify the courting of a rebuff, unless, of course, His Majesty's Government are determined not to allow themselves to be rebuffed.

If, on the other hand, these episodes are not taken by themselves, but as part of the whole policy of the Turkish Government as described in Sir E. Grey's despatch of the 17th October, there can be no doubt that the material damage to the interests (mainly Indian) that have been built up in Mesopotamia by a century of peaceful and legitimate enterprise, and the loss of prestige in what we have—by considerable expenditure of life and money—made predominantly a British sea, warrant the strongest possible measures on the part of His Majesty's Government. But the question then becomes one of such magnitude that, as Lord Crewe recognises, Indian interests must take their place among the wider interests which do not fall within the competence of the Secretary of State for India.

Looking at the question from the Indian point of view, his Lordship would suggest that the time has come when it is not only desirable but necessary for His Majesty's Government to explain clearly and comprehensively to the Turkish Government what their interests in those regions really are, and what is the policy that they deliberately intend to pursue, and, if possible, to arrive at some such general settlement as was advocated by Lieutenant-Colonel Cox in the telegram enclosed in my letter of the 9th December. The desirability of this course is illustrated by the extracts from the Turkish journal "Tanin," reported in the "Morning Post" of the 28th December (copy enclosed*). The article from which these extracts are taken is apparently the result of the visit of Ismail Hakki Bey to Bagdad, which is referred to in Mr. Marling's despatch No. 865 of the 29th November and in Mr. Consul-General Lorimer's summary for October 1910 (copy of which was sent to your department on the 28th December). It appears to Lord Crewe that Great Britain is at present incurring all the odium, without obtaining any of the benefits, of an active policy at the head of the Gulf, and that in these circumstances no harm can, and some good may, be done by entering into the explanations suggested above. If these explanations were received in a friendly spirit and with a manifest desire to arrive at an accommodation (which, it may be admitted, is unlikely), the object of His Majesty's Government would so far have been achieved. If not, it would probably be necessary to strengthen the squadron in the Gulf, so as to enable it to act independently of the blockade operations, and, by summarily removing all signs of Turkish authority from places where we do not admit their rights, and affording the

* Not printed.

Sheikhs of Koweit and Mohammerah material as well as moral support in their disputes with the Turkish Government, to convince the latter that we are in earnest.

If, however, this course is on general grounds thought to be impracticable at the present juncture, Lord Crewe does not consider, for the reasons given above, that the two proposals immediately in question are worth pursuing separately, though he would favour such a cruise as the naval commander-in-chief proposes, with the omission of the visit to Zakhnuniyeh. He can only suggest that we should wait until a stronger case arises, such as the arrival of mudirs at Wakra, &c., and then take the necessary action locally, *e.g.*, in the case of the mudirs, remove them.

I am, &c.
R. RITCHIE.

Enclosure 1 in No. 151.

The Earl of Crewe to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P. *India Office, December* 22, 1910.

PIRACIES in the Persian Gulf. Please refer to my telegram dated the 9th December, 1910.

In the opinion of His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Constantinople, a rebuff would be the only result of representations whether at Bussorah or Constantinople. The supposition in your telegram dated the 18th November, 1910, that general representations had been made to the Turkish Government was, as you are now aware, incorrect. It is possible, however, that Zakhnuniyeh will shortly be visited by His Majesty's ships and the Turks removed therefrom, and that some naval demonstration at the head of the Gulf will be made. Please say whether you have any other suggestions as to action locally. Would the inclusion of a visit to Mohammerah be of any use? Please say what arrangements for patrolling the river have actually been made.

Enclosure 2 in No. 151.

Government of India to the Earl of Crewe.

(Telegraphic.) P. *December* 28, 1910.

YOUR telegram dated the 22nd December as to piracies in the Persian Gulf.

Following telegram received from Resident, Persian Gulf, whom we consulted:—

"I am informed by the commander-in-chief that, subject to the exigencies of the arms traffic, and provided that a passage can be found through the unsurveyed approaches to the island, he will be in a position, when called upon, to send two ships to do what is necessary at Zakhnuniyeh. After that he would propose to visit all ports where pretensions are advanced by the Turks, proceeding to the Shat-el-Arab, where he would propose to take three, or perhaps four, ships, at the last. Above proceedings he would contemplate taking at the beginning of April or end of March 1911.

"We do not consider it possible at present for us to take any specific local action with regard to the Koweit piracy case, which, it will be remembered, took place on the high sea, if we are not prepared to make good at Constantinople a demand that the accused men should be surrendered. On his return from Karun, Sheikh of Mohammerah might be got to address a formal application for surrender of culprits to the Turkish authorities, who will be put more in the wrong if they refuse to comply. There does not seem to be anything to be done beyond this. Active interest appears no longer to be taken in the matter by Sheikh of Koweit.

"As to the question whether, for the present, the river is being patrolled, His Majesty's ship has been withdrawn owing to the fact that no dhows remain in the river, the date season having come to an end for the year. Revival of the Mishri affair is the only trouble likely to arise. We are not immediately concerned by that question, but commander-in-chief would send a ship of the squadron at short notice, if Turkish Government shows signs of giving trouble to the sheikh."

Views of commander-in-chief and resident have our support. As regards Mishri affair, papers on the subject were forwarded by letter dated the 8th instant from Secretary to Government of India, Foreign Department, to Secretary, Political Department, India Office.